What is the importance of natural resources to our national economy? I cite this example:

Recent studies measured the total value of raw timber to the consumer. The 1958 harvest of timber, before it was cut from the forests, had a value of $1 billion. Value added to that timber in the course of harvesting, processing, fabrication and secondary manufacture, transportation, and distribution to the consumer amounts to $23 billion.

Concurrently, the growing and protection of the trees cut in that harvest involved 80,000 man-years of employment. The various operations which added value to that raw material, between the forests and the ultimate users, involved more than 3 million man-years of employment.

This single industry represents about 5 percent of our gross national product. The same pattern may be found in other natural resource industries.

Therefore, it must be stressed that whether you are from Connecticut or Alabama, from Michigan or Arizona, the natural resources produced in Washington or in Georgia, in Maine or in Colorado are vitally important to you as an individual.

These are not provincial things, important only to the individual actually on the land producing the raw commodity. Every American home, farm, business, and industry still is dependent upon a constant flow of natural resources. This will always be so.

This brings us to the resources themselves.

Soil and water are the two basic resources and they are closely intertwined. Everything depends upon our fertile soil, and water is the agent which brings the soil to life and permits the development of all our other resources.

Therefore, it is fundamental to all our Nation that the watersheds be protected so that their resources may be developed.

For too long we have assumed that water will be available to meet our every demand.

You turn on the faucet and assume the water will be there, but more and more we are finding instances when the well has run dry. Every part of our Nation has experienced this, whether it be a California farmer whose crops have suffered from lack of mountain water or the New York city dweller whose car is dirty because the faucet ran dry.

Our expanding population and an ever-increasing demand for water for domestic, agricultural, and industrial purposes are placing constantly growing demands on our water supply.

Just since the turn of the century, the estimated daily use for all purposes has risen from 530 gallons per capita to 1,600 gallons per capita daily. The forecast is that it will reach 2,200 gallons by 1975.

In total figures, the daily use of water in the United States has increased from 40 billion gallons at the turn of the century in 1900 to some 265 billion gallons today. The total could reach 600 billion gallons consumed daily by the year 1980. Just how much is 600 billion gallons which this Nation will consume daily in less than 20 years?

Most of you have visited Lake Mead. At that rate it would take only 12 days to drain this tremendous reservoir.

An inseparable partner in the development of water resources is hydroelectric power. This is the cash register of many water projects. To ignore hydroelectric power would be to throw away one of our most valuable assets and also the asset which is the principal means of paying for the vast investment we must make in resource development.

Again, the benefits of this power are not restricted to the immediate area in the vicinity of the powerhouse.

Recent advances in transmission of electrical energy have shown this technically. The distance which direct current energy may be transmitted now is almost unlimited. Economically, it is feasible to deliver power a thousand or more miles from the powerhouse.

I personally think it was a grave mistake to limit the TVA service area to a 150 miles or so. I visualize the day when a transmission grid connects every corner of our Nation and even possibly connects our power network with that of Canada.

When that day comes, there should be adequate power so that every person in this Nation may enjoy the full advantages of electricity in his home, his farm, his business.

I would like to say at this point that the rural electric power cooperatives have done a magnificent job in providing electrical energy to the householders and the farmers of our great Nation.

Sometimes the advantages have come in strange and roundabout ways.

Take, for instance, the case of the Amargosa cooperative here in Nevada. I became interested in this cooperative when it was formed and came to the REA for assistance. It appeared that the cooperative could serve some of the people in California whom I represent.

These people in the Death Valley area never have had electrical service. As the Amargosa cooperative moved ahead, the private power companies suddenly became interested in my people for the first time, I might add.

They applied to serve the area. The California Public Utilities Commission granted the license to the private utilty.

Even though Amargosa did not receive the license to serve the area, I am convinced that if it had not been for the interest of this fine REA cooperative the private utilities would never have served these people.

The area still would be without electrical energy.

The rural electric cooperative have done great things for this country since Franklin D. Roosevelt created the REA on May 11, 1935.

I might say that President Roosevelt was following in the footsteps of another great President, the conservation-minded Teddy Roosevelt, who brought to the people of the United States the realization of the urgent necessity of husbanding and utilizing wisely our God-given natural resources.

The cooperative movement came into being shortly thereafter, when the private power utilities failed to respond to the challenge of the times and continued to neglect the rural people of our Nation.

Their policy was stated publicly that there were very few farms requiring electricity for major farm purposes that were not already served.

That was a quarter century ago—when 89 percent of the U.S. farms were without electricity.

As a result of the strong cooperative movement the situation has been reversed.

Today, 97.6 percent of the 3,700,000 farms in our country are enjoying the benefits of electrical energy.

You can be proud of this record.

Rural Electrification Administration loans have totaled nearly $4,800 million since REA was first conceived.

One and a half million miles of lines are serving 5 million REA consumers.

You, the leaders of the rural electric cooperative movement, have done a magnificent job in bringing electrical energy to the people of this Nation.

Nine out of every ten agencies participating in the REA program are rural electric cooperatives.

This Nation has a continuing challenge to meet its responsibilities in the development, conservation, and intelligent, balanced utilization of our natural resources.

Through your farsighted efforts on behalf of electrical development you have proven your leadership in the conservation and utilization of one of our most important resources—electrical energy.

You recognize the national importance of this resource.

And, in closing, may I stress that the same holds true for all resources—soil, water, power, grazing lands, timber, minerals, and all the rest.

These are national, not local, resources.

With the help of leaders such as you this Nation can meet the challenge set before its President just last Thursday.

We can provide for greater demands for the products of our water, our soil, our forests, and minerals, and in so doing we can eliminate poverty and want and we can increase employment.

We can help our neighbors and ourselves to raise our standards of living.

This, to my way of thinking, is the only sure way which we can solve our domestic and international economic and social problems, so important to a stable and peaceful free world.

Thank you.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1963

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

Rabbi Theodore Lewis, Touro Synagogue, of Newport, R.I., offered the following prayer:

We beseech Thee, O God, to give of Thy blessings to the Members of this distinguished assembly, the U.S. Senate. They have need of Thy divine guidance and inspiration as they deliberate on complex matters that affect not only every citizen of this land, but also the whole human race.

Imbue them, O God, with wisdom of heart and mind, that they may arrive at just, equitable, and lasting solutions to the perplexing problems that confront them.

Keep them alert and vigilant, that they may vigorously resist any encroachment on the liberties that we now enjoy.

Grant them inflexibility of courage and fortitude of spirit, that they be not deflected from the noble ideals to which they have dedicated themselves.

May their actions ever be a reflection of the immortal words that George Washington addressed to the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R.I., "To bigotry, no sanction; to persecution, no assistance," for it is only when prejudice and bias give way to harmony and brotherhood can there be hope for peace, stability, and survival for mankind.

May it be Thy will, O God, that the concept of the brotherhood of man, as expressed in such vital terms in these United States of America, shall extend beyond these shores, so that there will be ushered in an era of amity and fellowship between all races, an era in which nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. Amen.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Federal contributions, for the quarter ended September 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, covering the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress of the liquidation activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the quarter ended December 31, 1962; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

MARKETING OF POWER GENERATED AT AMISTAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS AT CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE, IMPERIAL COUNTY, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS AT MOJAVE "B" AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave "B" Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON REFUGEE-ESCAPEES PAROLED INTO THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, individual reports on refugee-escapees paroled into the United States, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESCISSION OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order rescinding suspension of deportation in the case of Joseph Bilenco, also known as Joseph Addison Blake, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to the alien, and the reasons for ordering the rescission of suspension of deportation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 62

"Resolution requesting Congress to continue assistance to the junior ROTC programs; and for other purposes.

"Whereas the U.S. Congress has evidenced its intention to discontinue Federal assistance to educational institutions which provide a junior ROTC program for its students; and

"Whereas, in both World War II and the Korean conflict, it has been graphically demonstrated that a strong reserve officer training program is vital to the national defense; and

"Whereas in this time of continuing national emergency, precipitated by rash acts of the Communist bloc countries, which create crises in which a strong national defense posture must be maintained; and

"Whereas the junior ROTC program has demonstrated that it is a vital and integral part of our national defense preparations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body urgently requests that the U.S. Congress continue to provide appropriations to assist local educational institutions in continuing to provide a junior ROTC program; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and instructed to transmit to the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Secretary of the U.S. Senate a sufficient number of copies of this resolution to be distributed among the membership thereof.

"Read and adopted in the house January 25, 1963.

"Read and adopted in the senate February 11, 1963."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 12

"Whereas Sir Winston Churchill has, by his courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership both in war and in peace, assured for himself a place of eminence among the great men of history; and

"Whereas it is proper that the highest honor and acclaim be accorded Sir Winston Churchill during his lifetime; and

"Whereas the greatest honor that this legislature can confer is the grant of citizenship in the great State of Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 37th session assembled:

"1. That full citizenship in the great State of Nebraska, with all rights and privileges appertaining thereto, is hereby granted Sir Winston Churchill.

"2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and signed by the president of the legislature be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to Sir Winston Churchill, Vice President Johnson, Senator Young, Senator Javits, Senator Magnuson, Senator Roman Hruska, Senator Curtis, Congressmen Cunningham, Martin and Beermann.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.

"Attest:

"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the late Senator Henry Dworshak was a champion of full development of our Nation's water resources and a man of boundless energy and a tireless worker for Idaho during his 23 years he served the Gem State in Congress; and

"Whereas he constantly sought cooperation among all levels of government and private enterprise in water resource development to achieve the greatest benefit for the greatest number of persons with the least amount of bureaucratic control and interference; and

"Whereas the Bruces Eddy project on the North Fork of the Clearwater River, which project was authorized shortly after his death, was a project which he sought and worked for in cooperation with local, State, regional, and national water resource development interests: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned, as a fitting memorial to our distinguished late Senator Henry Dworshak for his many years of tireless and productive work in resource development and for his patience and perseverance in promoting this project, that early action be taken to implement a change of name from Bruces Eddy to Henry Dworshak Dam: and be it further

"Resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 5th day of February 1963.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 6th day of February 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"ARTHUR WILSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"To the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Grays Harbor in peace and war is a vital port on the Pacific coast of the United States; and

"Whereas Grays Harbor does possess modern facilities for the handling of deep ship cargoes; and

"Whereas Grays Harbor in times of national emergency has demonstrated its worth as a military port; and

"Whereas Grays Harbor is an outstanding commercial fishing port; and

"Whereas Grays Harbor has found favor with the citizens of our Nation as one of the finest recreational fishing areas and Westport has become known as the salmon fishing capital of the world; and

"Whereas navigation of the Grays Harbor entrance by both large and small vessels is becoming increasingly hazardous due to the deteriorated condition of the Grays Harbor south jetty; and

"Whereas many lives and much property have been lost due to conditions at the Grays Harbor entrance; and

"Whereas the national administration is extending aid to depressed areas; and

"Whereas this area has been determined to be a depressed area; and

"Whereas this requested project would materially aid the economy of this area;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States will enact legislation to authorize and make appropriations to: Reconstruct the Grays Harbor south jetty at this time to breakwater standards; and be it

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative of the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS TO CONTINUE SUPPORT OF THE TOBACCO RESEARCH PROGRAM AT THE AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE CENTER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

"Whereas during 1960 and 1961 there was appropriated and allocated by the general assembly for an Agricultural Science Center at the University of Kentucky and for tobacco research at such center, more than $1 million; and

"Whereas the Governor of this Commonwealth subsequently made available an additional $1 million for construction and research at such center; and

"Whereas in 1962 there was appropriated and allocated by the general assembly more than $2 million for construction and research at such center; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated since 1960 more than $200,000 each year to the Agricultural Research Service for tobacco research, a large portion of which has been allocated to the Agricultural Research Center of the University of Kentucky for this project; and

"Whereas tobacco ranks fifth as a crop in terms of income to farm families, and provides the raw material for one of the major industries in the United States; and

"Whereas tobacco taxes contribute approximately $2.5 billion annually to the support of Federal, State, and local governments; and

"Whereas scientific and technical changes have greatly affected American agriculture as a whole, but tobacco has been heretofore neglected in terms of an adequate scientific research program; and

"Whereas extensive construction has already been accomplished at the Agricultural Science Center of the University of Kentucky; new tobacco research is already underway at such center; and such center is now provided and equipped for that purpose with expensive scientific equipment specifically developed for tobacco research, including environmental control units, spectrophotometers, strain gage controls, time lapse cameras, dynamic test machines and precision strain gage load controls; and

"Whereas continuance of the tobacco research program at the Agricultural Science Center of the University of Kentucky would be to the advantage of this Commonwealth and the nation generally, by avoiding uneconomical duplication of research efforts and expenses incident thereto: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States and the Department of Agriculture of the United States are urged to continue their support, through adequate appropriations and allocations, of tobacco research on all kinds of tobacco at the Agricultural Science Center of the University of Kentucky, supplementing appropriations and allocations heretofore made and hereafter to be made by this Commonwealth.

"SEC. 2. The clerk of the senate shall send a copy of this resolution to the Presiding Officer and Chief Clerk of each Chamber of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to each member of the Kentucky congressional delegation.

"Attest:

"JOHN N. WILLIS,
"Clerk of Senate."

RESOLUTION OF BREWERY WORKERS LOCAL NO. 16, BUFFALO, N.Y., ON EXCISE TAXES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted on January 22, 1963, by the Brewery Workers Local No. 16 of Buffalo, N.Y., urging the Congress to permit the expiration of wartime excise taxes on their scheduled expiration date of June 30, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE U.S. CONGRESS TO ALLOW THE AUTOMATIC RATE REDUCTION ON CERTAIN EXCISE TAX RATES

Whereas Federal excise taxes were substantially increased to the "war tax rate" on many manufactured items by the Revenue Acts of 1943, 1945, and 1947; and

Whereas these rates were even further increased by the Revenue Act of 1951 for the purpose of a temporary Korean wartime emergency; and

Whereas all excise rates were reduced to prewar tax rates by the Excise Reduction Act of 1954, with the exception of alcoholic beverages, gasoline, diesel fuel, cigarettes, and motor vehicle chassis, which products continued to be taxed at the highest rate, but were scheduled for automatic reduction on March 31, 1955; and

Whereas the Revenue Acts of 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961 continued to postpone the automatic reduction on these items; and

Whereas the Revenue Act of 1962 once more postponed the rate reduction date on these selected items from July 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963; and

Whereas the wartime emergency which occasioned the imposition of the additional excise on these selected items now no longer exists; and

Whereas war tax rates are so high as to substantially reduce sales in a peacetime market; and

Whereas the excessive taxation of these selected products has restricted wages and job opportunities for organized labor in the particular industries manufacturing these goods, and has prevented business expansion in these businesses because they could not keep pace with less highly taxed items: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Brewery Workers Local No. 16, of 821 Washington Street, Buffalo, N.Y., representing 500 workers and members, hereby goes on record as favoring the reduction of these oppressive excises and respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to permit these war tax rates to expire on the scheduled date of June 30, 1963.

Adopted at meeting on 22d day of January 1963.

JOSEPH L. DOUFLIN,
Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 808. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the setting aside of an area within the Canal Zone to preserve and conserve its natural features for scientific study, for providing and maintaining facilities for such study, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 809. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634), as amended (40 U.S.C. 193 (n) – (w)), relating to the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 810. A bill to authorize the chartering of organizations to insure conventional mortgage loans, to authorize the creation of secondary market organizations for conventional and other mortgage loans, to authorize the issuance of debentures upon the security of insured or guaranteed mortgages and to create a joint supervisory board to charter and examine such organizations, and for other purposes; and

S. 811. A bill to enable Federal Home Loan Banks to implement their services to their member institutions by establishing a secondary marketing facility for participations in conventional home mortgage loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 812. A bill to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 813. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965;

S. 814. A bill to amend Section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 815. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 816. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 817. A bill for the relief of Sonja Kirsten Høj; and

S. 818. A bill for the relief of Ruth Ahlmann Jensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 819. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to all lands lying below the high water line of Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.; and

S. 821. A bill for the relief of John Puli, Mrs. Salote Puli, Sharon Puli, Anna Puli, and Benjamin Puli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 822. A bill for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 823. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. McGOVERN):

S. 824. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold produced in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 825. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 826. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on ethylene imine (monomer), polyethylene imine, and beta-amino ethyl sulfuric acid ester, or its inner salt, as well as such substituted beta-amino ethyl sulfuric acid esters, or their inner salts, in which one or more of the hydrogens have been replaced with simple alkyl radicals of no more than seven carbons per radical; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 827. A bill for the relief of certain persons who were employed by the L. L. Constantin Electronics Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 828. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 829. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 830. A bill for the relief of Dr. Murat A. Avadikoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DODD, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. STENNIS):

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGEE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

CONSIDERATION OF BALTIC STATES QUESTION BY UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KEATING submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) favoring consideration of the Baltic States question by the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KEATING, which appears under a separate heading.)

DESIGNATION OF "BOURBON WHISKEY" AS A DISTINCTIVE PRODUCT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORTON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19); which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas it has been the commercial policy of the United States to recognize marks of origin applicable to alcoholic beverages imported into the United States; and

Whereas such commercial policy has been implemented by the promulgation of appropriate regulations which, among other things, establish standards of identity for such imported alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas among the standards of identity which have been established are those for "Scotch whisky" as a distinctive product of Scotland, manufactured in Scotland in compliance with the laws of Great Britain regulating the manufacture of Scotch whisky for consumption in Great Britain and for "Canadian whisky" as a distinctive product of Canada, manufactured in Canada in compliance with the laws of the Dominion of Canada regulating the manufacture of whisky for consumption in Canada and for "cognac" as grape brandy distilled in the Cognac region of France, which is entitled to be so designated by the laws and regulations of the French Government; and

Whereas bourbon whiskey is a distinctive product of the United States and is unlike other types of alcoholic beverages, whether imported or domestic; and

Whereas to be entitled to the designation "bourbon whiskey" the product must conform to the highest standards and must be manufactured in accordance with the laws and regulations of the United States which prescribe a standard of identity for "bourbon whiskey"; and

Whereas bourbon whiskey has achieved recognition and acceptance throughout the world as a distinctive product of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the recognition of bourbon whiskey as a distinctive product of the United States be brought to the attention of the appropriate agencies of the United States Government toward the end that such agencies will take appropriate action to prohibit the importation into the United States of whisky designated as "bourbon whiskey", unless it is clearly labeled to show the country of origin as an integral part of the name.

DENIAL OF SELF-DETERMINATION TO THE PEOPLES OF VARIOUS COUNTRIES

Mr. HRUSKA submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) to express the sense of Congress on bringing before the United Nations the issue of denial of self-determination to the peoples of various countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HRUSKA, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution relative to the appointment of a citizen to the Smithsonian Institution, and two bills relating to that Institution; one which would permit it to police the new building being built, and the other which would enlarge its authority in the Canal Zone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The bills and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Senators ANDERSON and FULBRIGHT), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 808. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the setting aside of an area within the Canal Zone to preserve and conserve its natural features for scientific study, for providing and maintaining facilities for such study, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940.

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 809. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634), as amended (40 U.S.C. 193(n)–(w), relating to the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; and

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MORTGAGE MARKET FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to the establishment of new secondary market facilities for home mortgages. For many years now, I have had a special interest in housing and housing legislation, particularly those measures which enable private enterprise to do the job with a minimum of reliance on Federal aids and subsidies. I hope that careful consideration will be given to these new proposals.

Although the Federal National Mortgage Association has offered a secondary market program for FHA and VA loans, there never has been any organized market for conventional mortgages even though, by far, the largest part of our home financing is through the conventional loan.

At the present time, a financial institution which wishes to sell a conventional mortgage must find its own buyer. Some State and national organizations publish informal lists of offerings, but such listings obviously have no official status.

The first bill I introduce is the Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963. I introduced a similar proposal during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

MORTGAGE MARKET FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

The objective of the Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963 is to enable every lender, large or small, to originate mortgage loans without fear that such loans may subsequently prove unmarketable. If this is accomplished within the framework of private enterprise and without financial assistance from the Government, the benefits derived will be highly significant in meeting the challenges of the housing boom anticipated to commence in the last years of this decade.

Today's mortgage market is inadequately organized to meet the needs of a growing population, and this inadequacy has frequently led to Government intervention. Mortgages traded on a secondary market rarely exceed 2 percent of total outstanding mortgages annually and this includes the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. As a result of this lack of marketability on the part of the conventional mortgage, unduly wide spreads in interest rates have existed between capital surplus and capital scarce areas. In addition, a very uneven flow of funds resulted in the mortgage market between such areas. When mortgage funds are in greatest demand lenders in capital scarce areas frequently hesitate to invest heavily in an instrument of credit which they regard relatively unmarketable.

As a result of these inadequacies in mortgage financing, potential homeowners in many areas at a time when the housing demand is greatest, find their demands unsatisfied, and this was further reflected in fluctuations in employment and output in the housing supply industry.

The Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963 would create within the framework of private enterprise an instrument of credit that would be fully as marketable as any other in our capital structure. This would first of all eliminate the uneven flow of mortgage funds which has plagued the housing industry. It would furthermore reduce the cost of financing by making mortgage credit more efficient. It would add funds to the housing market when demands for these are greatest by eliminating the bias which now exists in the allocation of credit as a result of a poorly organized mortgage market.

As a nation we have always encouraged private initiative, and although we have found that in many instances large firms naturally develop, the Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963 would enable small lenders to participate as effectively in mortgage originations and investments as the larger firms. Today's secondary mortgage market is highly sophisticated and complex and relies heavily on personal contacts. This either discourages or disqualifies the small lenders from participating in the secondary market.

The present proposal would create an organization or several organizations which would make it so simple to buy and sell mortgages within the framework of market conditions, that all lenders, large, medium sized, or small, would have an equal opportunity to satisfy their community's housing requirements.

In summary, the Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963 would strengthen private enterprise in housing, would reduce financing costs, even the flow of mortgage funds, and give all lenders, large or small, the same opportunity to participate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a section-by-section summary of the Mortgage Market Facilities

Act of 1963 inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The bill (S. 810) to authorize the chartering of organizations to insure conventional mortgage loans, to authorize the creation of secondary market organizations for conventional and other mortgage loans, to authorize the issuance of debentures upon the security of insured or guaranteed mortgages and to create a joint supervisory board to charter and examine such organizations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The summary presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

SUMMARY OF MORTGAGE MARKET FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

TITLE I: SHORT TITLE, STATEMENT OF PURPOSE, AND DEFINITIONS

Section 101. Short title: Contains a table of contents and provides that the act may be cited as the "Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963."

Section 102. Statement of policy: Provides that "the Congress desires to make additional facilities available to increase the market for conventional and insured mortgages as a means of improving the housing conditions of the American people."

Section 103. Definitions: Provides definitions of the following terms used throughout the act: "Joint Board," "Chairman," "mortgage," "first mortgage," "mortgage insurance corporation," "mortgage marketing corporation," and "United States."

TITLE II: JOINT SUPERVISORY BOARD FOR MORTGAGE INSURANCE AND MARKETING CORPORATIONS

Section 201. Establishment: Provides for the creation of a Joint Supervisory Board for Mortgage Insurance and Marketing Corporations (Joint Board) to consist of five members, with its principal office in the District of Columbia.

Section 202. Chairman and Directors: Subsection (a) provides for the appointment of the Chairman of the Joint Board by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman is to serve a 6-year term at a salary of $------ per annum. Subsection (b) provides that in addition to the Chairman, the Directors of the Joint Board shall be the Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, all ex officio; and a person appointed by the President from among persons recommended by the supervisors of banking in the various States who shall serve for a term of 6 years at a stated salary. All decisions of the Board to be effective shall require the affirmative vote of at least three Directors, at least one of whom shall be other than an ex officio Director. Each ex officio Director may delegate his duties and responsibilities under the act to an assistant.

Section 203. General Powers: Subsection (a) provides the Joint Board with power to charter, audit, inspect, and examine corporations organized under the act, to require such corporations to prepare and file reports, to subpena witnesses, to hold hearings, and to issue rules and regulations. The Joint Board is to send an annual report to Congress. Subsection (b) pertains to employees of the Joint Board. Subsection (c) allows the Joint Board to avail itself of the use of information, services, etc., of other Government agencies on a reimbursable basis.

Section 204. Taxation provisions: Provides that corporations organized under this act shall be subject to taxation to the same extent as State-chartered corporations.

Section 205. Expenses: Authorizes appropriations as may be necessary for salaries and other necessary expenses of the Joint Board. Beginning with the third full year after enactment of the act, the Joint Board will assess corporations organized under this act in amounts sufficient to cover expenses of the Joint Board. Amounts thus assessed will be paid into the Treasury.

Section 206. Forfeiture of charter: Establishes a procedure for involuntary forfeiture of the charter of a corporation established under this act and liquidation of the corporation.

Section 207. Injunction: Provides that the Joint Board may bring an action to enjoin a violation of the act and to enforce compliance with the act.

Section 208. Removal of Director, officer, etc.: Provides for a procedure whereby the Joint Board may remove a Director, officer, attorney, employee, or agent of a corporation organized under the act for cause.

Section 209. Review of order; rehearing: Provides for judicial review and rehearing of an order of the Joint Board removing an individual from office.

TITLE III: MORTGAGE INSURANCE CORPORATIONS

Section 301. Establishment: Provides for the chartering by the Joint Board of mortgage insurance corporations upon the approval of an application submitted by not less than five natural persons of good repute.

Section 302. Insurance authorization: Subsection (a) authorizes a mortgage insurance corporation organized under this act to (1) insure not less than 100 percent of the unpaid principal and interest on loans in the form of obligations secured by mortgages; and (2) establish, through action by the Board of Directors, an adequate insurance premium for such insurance which shall be set, and the initial capital be allocated, so that there shall be maintained at all times unimpaired capital, surplus, and undivided profits in an aggregate amount, upon the basis of market value, of not less than 5 percent of the unpaid principal amounts of all outstanding contracts of mortgage insurance. At least 50 percent of the capital shall be invested in obligations of or guaranteed by the United States and the remainder in other obligations or securities approved by the Joint Board. All other funds shall be safely invested with due regard to the purpose of the corporation. Subsection (b) provides that a loan insured by a mortgage insurance corporation shall have a maximum term not exceeding 30 years; shall be secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which payments shall be made in equal amounts from month to month and are sufficient to (1) amortize the entire principal of the loan within the period ending on the date of its maturity; (2) cover interest applicable to each payment period; and (3) cover the premium applicable to each payment period; shall have a loan-to-value ratio not exceeding 90 percent of appraised value as approved by the corporation or sales price, whichever is less; shall be in an amount not exceeding $30,000; shall be on a one- to four-family residential property or condominium which is or will be occupied in whole or in part by the mortgagor; and shall be originated and serviced by an organization approved by the mortgage insurance corporation.

Section 303. Payment: Provides that a mortgage insurance corporation organized under this title shall pay in cash without delay the insurance claims of any applicant submitting appropriate evidence of ownership of a defaulted loan insured under authority conferred by this act, but such payment shall not be made until (1) there is a default in any payment of principal or interest on the loan or the insurance premium and such default is not cured by subsequent payment in not less than 91 days; and (2) the mortgagee conveys to the mortgage insurance corporation clear title to the property; and (3) the mortgagee assigns to the mortgage insurance corporation all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction, except such claims as may have been released with the consent of the Joint Board. Such payment shall include interest and allowances (including foreclosure costs) from time of default as approved under regulations of the Joint Board in effect at the time the mortgage was insured.

Section 304. Succession: Provides that "each mortgage insurance corporation organized under this title shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by act of its shareholders or its franchise becomes forfeited by order of the Joint Board."

Section 305. General powers: Empowers mortgage insurance corporations to adopt and use a corporate seal, to adopt bylaws, to make contracts, etc.

Section 306. Citizenship: Provides that a mortgage insurance corporation shall be deemed a citizen of the State in which its principal office is located.

Section 307. Capital requirements: Provides that the minimum subscribed initial capital shall be $25 million and shall be represented by shares of stock each with a par value of $100. No authorization to commence business shall be granted by the Joint Board to any mortgage insurance corporation until the Joint Board is satisfied that initial capital in the amount of not less than $5 million par value has been subscribed for at not less than par and paid in full in cash.

Section 308. Directors and officers: Provides for a Board of Directors of at least 9 but no more than 15 to be elected by the shareholders. The Board of Directors is to elect the officers.

TITLE IV: MORTAGE MARKETING CORPORATIONS

Section 401. Establishment: Provides for establishment of mortgage marketing corporations in the same manner as is provided for mortgage insurance corporations in section 301 above.

Section 402. Trading and debenture-insuring authorization: Authorizes mortgage marketing corporations to (1) purchase, sell and service mortgages on 1- to 4-family residential property and which are insured by a mortgage insurance corporation or insured or guaranteed by an agency of the United States; (2) publish data with respect to mortgages; (3) issue, with the approval of the Joint Board, and to have outstanding bonds, notes, or other obligations up to a maximum of 20 times the sum of its capital, surplus reserves, and undistributed earnings; (4) set underwriting fees, maturities, interest rates, etc., within the limits of standards prescribed by Joint Board regulations; and (5) purchase its outstanding obligations in the open market.

Section 403. Succession; section 404. General powers; section 405. Citizenship: Provisions identical to those pertaining to mortgage insurance corporations in sections 304, 305, and 306 above.

Section 404. General powers: Empowers mortgages marketing corporations to adopt and use a corporate seal, to adopt bylaws, to make contracts, etc.

Section 405. Citizenship: Provides that a mortgage marketing corporation shall be deemed a citizen of the State in which its principal office is located.

Section 406. Capital requirements: Provides that "no authorization to commence business shall be granted by the Joint Board to any mortgage marketing corporation until the Joint Board is satisfied that initial capital in the amount of not less than $5 million par value has been subscribed for at not less than par and paid in full in cash. Such capital shall be represented by shares of stock each with a par value of $100."

Section 407. Directors and officers: This provision is identical with section 308 above, which pertains to mortgage insurance corporations.

TITLE V: CHANGES IN RELATED STATUTES

Section 501. National Bank Act: Subsection (a) amends paragraph 7 of section 5136, United States Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24), so as to permit a national bank to purchase for its own account shares in mortgage insurance corporations and/or mortgage marketing corporations in an amount not exceeding 5 percent of the capital and surplus of the bank in either type of corporation.

Subsection (b) amends the same statute so as to permit a national bank to deal in, underwrite, and purchase for its own account, obligations of mortgage marketing corporations.

Section 502. Federal Reserve Act: Amends section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) so as to exempt corporations organized under the act from the maturity and loan-value percentage limitations of that section.

Section 503. Federal Home Loan Bank Act: Amends section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) so as to permit a Federal Home Loan Bank to invest assets in obligations of mortgage marketing corporations to the same extent as it may invest in obligations of the United States, in obligations of the FNMA, and in other securities under present law.

Section 504. Home Owners Loan Act: Amends section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act so as to permit a Federal savings and loan association, within certain limits, to invest in stock of mortgage insurance corporations, and mortgage marketing corporations, and in obligations of the latter.

Section 505. Securities Act of 1933: Exempts securities issued by mortgage insurance corporations and by mortgage marketing corporations from the requirements of the Securities Act of 1933.

Section 506. Investment Company Act of 1940: Exempts mortgage insurance corporations and mortgage marketing corporations from the Investment Company Act of 1940.

HOME MORTGAGE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the second bill I introduce is the Home Mortgage Corporation Act. The purpose of this bill is to enable Federal home loan banks to implement their services to member institutions by establishing a secondary marketing facility for participations in conventional home mortgages.

HOME MORTGAGE CORPORATION ACT

In the savings and loan field, the principal device for shifting of surplus funds to areas of scarcity is in the sale and purchase of participations in loans rather than the entire loans. A savings and loan in California will originate $1 million worth of mortgages and sell a participating interest in them to eastern institutions. To date, nearly $2 billion worth of participation loans have been sold, even though the program is only 6 years old. But the sales and purchases are on an individual basis arranged largely by individual managers who contact their friends or who get together at various savings and loan conventions.

The secondary market proposal developed by the savings and loan industry will establish a new corporation within the Federal Home Loan Bank System which would buy and sell participations, thus providing an immediate and highly respected marketplace for the entire industry. No Government funds would be involved, because the corporation would obtain its capital from the savings and loan owned Federal home loan banks and from the institutions who sell participations to the corporation. The corporation could also issue obligations up to 10 times the amount of its capital, surplus, and reserves. No provision is made for the buying and selling of entire mortgage loans, because the Revenue Act of 1962 raises a question as to the extent which savings and loans can buy and sell mortgages and still qualify as a domestic savings and loan association. There is no such question in connection with the buying and selling of participations in loans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief summary of the Home Mortgage Corporation Act inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 811) to enable Federal home loan banks to implement their services to their member institutions by establishing a secondary marketing facility for participations in conventional home mortgage loans introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The summary presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED HOME MORTGAGE CORPORATION ACT

The purpose of this bill is to enable Federal home loan banks to implement their services to their member institutions by establishing a secondary marketing facility for participations in conventional home mortgage loans.

The major provisions of the proposed bill are as follows:

1. A new corporation, titled the "Home Mortgage Corporation," would be created under a board of directors consisting of the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the presidents of the Federal home loan banks, one of which presidents the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall name as chairman of the board of directors. Such board of directors is given full power to organize, operate and regulate the activities of the corporation.

2. Initial capital of the corporation would come from a $50 million pro rata stock subscription by the Federal home loan banks, at the call of the board from time to time; each bank to take in proportion to its relative asset worth at the time of the call.

3. Each bank-member seller would be required to buy stock in the corporation in an amount equal to 1 percent of the purchase price of the home mortgage participations which it sells to the corporation, and would be required to retain such stock in an amount equal to 1 percent of the current balances on the participations such member has sold to the corporation which the corporation still holds.

4. Stock may be retired on a seniority basis in the discretion of the board from time to time so long as it is not reduced below $50 million or 10 percent of outstanding obligations of the corporation, whichever is greater.

5. The corporation could borrow money and issue obligations up to 10 times the amount of its capital, surplus, and reserves. Its obligations would be legal investments for Federal savings and loan associations.

6. In addition to the usual corporate powers, the corporation could buy and sell participations in home mortgages made by members of the Federal home loan banks on residential property, and secured by a first lien on such property.

7. Ten percent of net earnings of the corporation must go to reserves for losses until such reserves equal 50 percent of capital, and then 5 percent of net earnings must be added to such reserves until the reserves reach 100 percent of capital. The board may pay stock dividends from any remaining net earnings.

8. Federal home loan banks and Federal associations are expressly authorized to purchase stock of the corporation. Pending the enactment of enabling laws, other participating bank members may deposit the required 1 percent of participations sold to the corporation in cash in lieu of purchasing the required stock.

9. The corporation will be subject to taxation on the same basis as any other corporation.

RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS AND RESERVATIONS ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the Secretary of the Army on behalf of the United States of America.

On February 10, 1959, the Arkansas National Guard entered into a lease-purchase agreement with the Arkansas State Board of Education whereby 9.8 acres of Camp Joseph T. Robinson was transferred to the State board of education. The State board then proceeded to construct a warehouse at the cost of some $250,000 to be used exclusively by the board in their administration of the surplus property program under Public Law 152 of the 81st Congress, as amended.

Approximately 2½ years after the lease-purchase agreement was entered into and after the completion of the warehouse, the parties to the agreement were informed that the agreement breached the original conveyance of Camp Robinson to the State of Arkansas which provided that the property would immediately revert to the United States if said property should be used for purposes other than the training of the National Guard or for other military purposes.

Therefore, this bill is intended to grant relief to the Arkansas State Board of Education by correcting this inequity. It authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey and release all of the rights and reservations of the Federal Government

in these 9.8 acres upon payment of the fair market value of the property by the State of Arkansas to the Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 812) to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965.

This bill is being introduced at the request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to a recommendation contained in the President's budget message for fiscal year 1964. Mr. President, I ask that the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, requesting this legislation, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

Mr. President, the Reorganization Act of 1949 was approved by the Congress with the primary objective of implementing recommendations of the first Hoover Commission. It was a delegation of legislative authority by the Congress to the President in order that action on certain of the Hoover Commission's recommendations contained in its report might be expeditiously considered and acted upon promptly.

In the first 5 years following its enactment, there was a total of 51 reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress under authority of the act, of which 3 were duplications with certain changes. Of the remaining 48 plans, 40 were permitted to become law by the Congress, or were incorporated in other acts. In the last 9 years, however, although the act was extended three times for periods of 2 years as is again proposed by the bill I am introducing by request today, only 15 such plans were submitted, of which 7 were rejected. In some instances the plans were disapproved because the House of Representatives or the Senate held that they were not in accord with the basic purposes of the act, going beyond reorganizations into areas of policy, which was in conflict with the intent of the Congress in approving the act in 1949.

The Congress, therefore, in view of the use to which it had been diverted, and the decreasing need for such authority being vested in the President, did not again extend the act when it expired in 1959. At the request of the President, however, the act was reactivated in 1961. A total of nine plans were submitted to the Congress under this extension, in 1961 and 1962. Seven of these, relating to functions, operations, and reorganization of the regulatory agencies were submitted in 1961. Four of the seven were rejected, one by the Senate and three by the House.

In 1962, two plans were submitted under authority of the act. Plan No. 1 of 1962 proposed the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, although the Committee on Government Operations had previously held hearings on a bill which would have created such a department, S. 1633, on June 21–22, and had reported the bill to the Senate on September 6, 1961. When the reorganization plan was submitted on January 30, 1962, S. 1633 was pending on the Senate Calendar. The committee nevertheless proceeded to hold hearings on a resolution of disapproval of the plan—Senate Resolution 288—on February 14, 15, and 16, 1962.

Before the committee was able to obtain a corrected or complete transcript of the hearings, or had had an opportunity to draft a report to the Senate on the disapproving resolution, a motion was made on February 20, to discharge the committee, on the premise that it had been dilatory in taking action on the resolution which had been filed in the Senate only 21 days before. This motion was made without regard to the provision in the Reorganization Act, which permits the Congress to act on such plans within a period of 60 days. An analysis made by the staff of the committee relative to action on the 65 plans previously submitted showed that an average of 59 days had elapsed before final approval or rejection was voted on the 43 plans on which resolutions of disapproval were introduced. This tabulation included 10 plans on which more than 60 days elapsed due to the fact that the House was in recess for more than 3 days.

The motion to discharge the committee from consideration of plan No. 1 of 1962 was rejected by the Senate, and the House of Representatives adopted a resolution disapproving the plan on the following day.

Mr. President, although I am complying with the request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in introducing this measure, I wish to make it clear that I have serious reservations as to the need for any further extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949 as proposed by the bill. As I have outlined, its utilization has decreased substantially during recent years, and I believe the time has come for the Congress to give this proposal careful consideration before again delegating its legislative authority to the President. Before acting on the bill, it is essential that a careful analysis be made as to how this authority has been used in the past, whether or not there is any real need for extending the act, and whether the Congress wishes to again delegate its constitutional authority over legislation to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 813) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965.

This draft bill is submitted pursuant to the statement in the budget of the U.S. Government 1964 that "legislation will also be requested to extend the President's authority to transmit reorganization plans to the Congress, which under existing law expires June 1, 1963" (pt. IV, p. 111).

The Reorganization Act provides a useful, expeditious, and successful procedure by which the President may present, and the Congress may review, proposals for the reorganization of agencies and activities of the executive branch of the Government.

Under the original Reorganization Act of 1949 and its successive extensions, 47 reorganization plans have become effective. This act has permitted the achievement of timely reorganization, many of which have made possible signficant improvements in the organization and administration of executive agencies and functions. It thus constitutes a proven tool for a continuing need.

The Bureau of the Budget urges early and favorable consideration of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

KEMIT GORDON,
Director.

PAYMENT OF TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES TO CERTAIN STUDENT TRAINEES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 7(b) of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, so as to authorize the payment of travel and transportation expenses to student trainees when promoted upon completion of college work to shortage category positions.

An identical bill was introduced, reported, and approved by the House of Representatives during the 87th Congress, but was not received by this body until late in the session; therefore action was not completed on that measure during the last session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission dated January 30, 1963, and a statement of justification which was attached to the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 814) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN are as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Civil Service Commission on January 28, 1963, transmitted to the President of the Senate the attached legislative proposal "to amend section 7(b) of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended." The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that this proposal is now before your committee.

The proposal is a perfecting amendment that would authorize travel expenses for student trainees who are assigned to manpower shortage positions upon completion of college work.

Last year the Commission transmitted to Congress a similar proposal which was passed by the House and referred to your committee. (H.R. 8798.) A companion measure, S. 2592, was introduced by Senator JOHNSTON and was pending before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee at adjournment of the 87th Congress.

I appreciate your past support and I would like to enlist your future support of the proposal.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATION

Section 7(b) of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 provides that appropriations for the departments shall be available for travel and transportation expenses of student trainees when promoted upon completion of college work to position for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage.

Ostensibly, this subsection provides authority for all student trainees who, upon graduation, are placed in shortage category positions. Actually, a small group of trainees are excluded from coverage. Although assuming full professional status upon graduation, a small number of trainees do not, at that time, receive a promotion to a higher grade. These are the trainees covered by special training agreements between their employing agencies and the Civil Service Commission. These agreements are desirable, because of critical shortages in some occupations, to provide for more rapid advancements as trainees. This small group has, prior to graduation, already reached the grade level to which the majority of the trainees are promoted at time of graduation.

This amendment to section 7(b) of the Administrative Expenses Act is intended to provide the same authority for payment to all student trainees, whether or not a promotion to a higher grade level at time of graduation is involved. Enactment will affect very few employees, but will remove a potential source of irritation over unequal treatment of two groups of employees.

Cost estimates furnished by the Civil Service Commission in connection with enactment of Public Law 86–587 were based on the assumption that all student trainees moving into shortage category positions upon graduation would be eligible to receive these payments. Enactment of this legislation will not, therefore, result in Federal expenditures in excess of earlier cost estimates for this purpose. In connection with enactment of Public Law 86–587, the Civil Service Commission had estimated an annual cost of about $1 million. Only a very small fraction of this amount is to be paid to student trainees upon graduation from college. Most of the payments are to be made to persons appointed from outside the Federal service to shortage category positions.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION EXERCISED BY THE UNITED STATES OVER LAND USED FOR FEDERAL PURPOSES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes.

This bill is identical to proposed legislation developed after careful study by the Committee on Government Operations which was first introduced on July 11, 1956, to comply with recommendations of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States. In past Congresses the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. Moss] have joined with me in cosponsoring this proposed legislation, which is now being introduced as an administration bill at the request of the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Attorney General, setting forth the background and need for the proposed legislation, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 815) to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1963.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose for your consideration and appropriate reference a legislative proposal "To provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes." Similar legislation was introduced in both Houses of the 87th Congress but failed of enactment.

The general purpose of the legislation is to permit Federal agencies, in appropriate cases and with the consent of the States involved, to restore to the States certain legislative jurisdiction now vested in the United States over federally owned or operated lands and to assure that in the future the United States will receive only so much legislative jurisdiction as is essential to the proper performance of Federal functions. This would mean that persons residing on such properties would no longer, by virtue of the accident of the place of their abode, suffer disabilities with respect to voting, education, public health and safety, marriage and divorce, adoption, descent and distribution of property, and numerous other matters which are ordinarily provided for by State law.

This proposed legislation would carry out recommendations for revision of the Federal law made by the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas within the States. It is the result of several years of drafting, study, and refinement based on the Interdepartmental Committee's recommendations. Such legislation has received affirmative endorsement from 31 individual State Governors and 29 attorneys general, from the Governors Conference, from the Association of State Attorneys General, from the Council of State Governments and its committee on legislative jurisdiction, from the National Association of County Officials, from all interested Federal agencies, from the Joint Federal-State Action Committee and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and from numerous other sources. The Legislatures of the States of California and Utah have memorialized the Congress to enact similar bills.

Enactment into law of a bill such as that proposed will be a long step toward the elimination if problems arising out of Federal exercise of legislative jurisdiction. Their elimination will bring numerous benefits to residents of Federal areas and will be inestimably helpful to the Federal Government and to State and local governments.

Identical legislation, S. 1617, passed the Senate on May 27, 1960, too late for House action during the 86th Congress. S. 154 and H.R. 8540 were introduced in the 87th Congress in the same form, but were not reported out of committee. I urge prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation during the current Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and of Senators HUMPHREY, MUNDT, GRUENING, JAVITS, COTTON, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill proposing the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

This proposed legislation was perfected after 6 years of study by the committee and its subcommittees in an effort to strengthen Federal programs in the fields of science and technology, and to eliminate unnecessary duplication and overlapping between Government departments and agencies engaged in scientific and technological research.

The bill is the result of three separate hearings before the committee, beginning in 1958. In 1959 a somewhat similar bill was reported to the Senate. Further hearings were held on a revised bill, S. 2771, in the 87th Congress, on May 10 and July 24, 1962. These hearings reflected that there is a steady and relentless increase in the cost of research and development programs of the Federal departments and agencies, amounting to $10 billion in fiscal year 1962, exceeded $12 billion in fiscal year 1963, or more than the entire expenditures of the Federal Government prior to World War II, and is estimated in the President's budget to total $15 billion for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. President, this bill provides for the establishment of a Hoover-type Commission composed of representatives

from the legislative and executive branches of the Government and of persons from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities.

The objectives of the proposed Commission, which are set forth in detail in the report filed in the 87th Congress, Senate Report No. 1828, provide for a study of all of the programs, methods and procedures of the Federal departments and agencies which are operating, conducting, and financing scientific programs, with the objective of bringing about more economy and efficiency in the performance of these essential activities and functions. Deficiencies in some of these programs and the problems relating thereto have been outlined on numerous occasions before various committees of the Congress by informed authorities. They have stressed the urgent need for improvements in effecting necessary reorganizations and better coordination of existing programs. Emphasis has also been directed toward the need for developing a program for the elimination of duplication in science efforts, where one agency of Government works on programs which are underway in other agencies, or where research is being done on problems which have already been solved by other scientists. There is reason to believe that this occurs extensively, due primarily to serious deficiencies in the science information retrieval programs of the Federal Government.

The Commission, if established, would be specifically directed to study and recommend ways and means of meeting our scientific manpower needs, which President Kennedy described as one of the most critical problems facing our Nation. There are probably many other critical needs which require study and exploration, even beyond those included in the objectives of the proposed legislation.

In undertaking its studies the Commission would be vested with authority to set up a Science Advisory Panel of outstanding science, engineering, and technological authorities from all sections of the Nation to assist it in the performance of the functions outlined in the bill. The Commission is further directed to conduct a study of Federal scientific and technical activities, such as the deficiencies in scientific, engineering and technical information programs, including acquisition, processing, documentation, storage, retrieval, and distribution of scientific information; the urgency for accelerating scientific, engineering, and technical progress in a number of Federal agencies which perform some functions in these areas; and to recommend necessary reorganizations of scientific and technological activities of the Federal Government to improve their operations and to better coordinate their activities.

Witnesses at the hearings held last year suggested that a panel of experts in the fields of science and technology should be set up to serve the committees of Congress which deal with those problems. The enactment of the pending bill, and the establishment of the Science Advisory Panel provided for therein would enable the Congress to continue to call upon the experts named to such a panel after the proposed Commission has completed its work and submitted its reports and recommendations.

One of the basic objectives of the bill is to provide a medium through which individual Members and committees of the Congress can obtain information which is not now available to enable them to take appropriate legislative action to establish definite Federal policies in the field of science and technology. The reports and recommendations of the Commission will also provide a basis for an evaluation of programs which are presently in operation as well as those which are being proposed.

Evidence was also submitted at the hearings on S. 2771 in the 87th Congress which indicated that the Bureau of the Budget has reported that a detailed evaluation of existing science and technological operations of the numerous agencies operating in these fields has been found to be too difficult. The result has been that the agencies interested in procuring appropriated funds are not required to submit an evaluation of achievement under existing programs, but merely attempt to justify further appropriations of funds. Under this procedure, it was pointed out that Congress is required to appropriate funds on faith alone, since the appropriate committees and individual Members of Congress have no information which would permit them to evaluate the programs or to take the necessary action to eliminate excessive duplication and waste.

Should the Congress enact this measure, it will be provided with a means of obtaining information and facts that will better enable it to perform its appropriate constitutional function. The Committee on Government Operations is firmly convinced that there is a real need for a bipartisan commission to study all of the science and technological programs of the Federal Government as proposed by this bill. It is further convinced that its enactment will insure maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, in the formulation of a properly coordinated program with the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry, nonprofit, and other technological institutions at a reduced cost.

The committee in recommending this legislation in past Congresses considered it to be an essential first step in achieving these objectives so that the Congress and the President may have the benefit of the recommendation of qualified experts in the fields of science, engineering and technology upon which appropriate legislative action may be taken to promote more efficiency in the operation of these programs and to effect economies that are essential in conserving Federal funds and technological manpower.

Dr. Jerome B. Weisner, Director, Office of Science and Technology, appeared before the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations on July 31, 1962, approximately 7 weeks after Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, creating that Office became effective, in connection with the subcommittee's inquiry into Government contracting for research and development. The following are extracts from Dr. Weisner's testimony:

> There has been concern, first as to whether a Department of Science was needed to centralize science programs and operations that are now integrated in various departments and agencies, perhaps by combining National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administrtion, National Bureau of Standards, and so forth; and second, concern expressed in these studies as to whether staff resources in the Office of the President were adequate to meet his needs. * * *
>
> As I have said many people believe that the present system is inevitably evolving toward a Department of Science. However, I don't believe that a single Department of Science with the responsibility for all of the scientific activities of the Federal Government would be a workable arrangement because most of the scientific activities of the individual agencies are carried out in support of their specific missions. If, as has been proposed, a less comprehensive Department of Science were created—by consolidation of the Atomic Energy Commission, National Science Foundation, National Bureau of Standards, and other agencies I talked about earlier—their operations might be made more effective. There would still be need, however, to coordinate and integrate their activities with that of the mission-oriented agencies having related scientific and technical programs. In other words, the OST is neither a substitute for nor in competition with a Federal Department of Science.

This statement by Dr. Weisner is in accord with the views expressed repeatedly by this committee, and conforms to the objectives set forth in the bill we are introducing today. The committee has always taken the view that a comprehensive study must be made by a commission composed of qualified persons who are familiar with the problems relating to the operation and support of science and technological programs by the Federal Government. The committee has also repeatedly pointed out that such a study is vital in order to determine whether there is a need for a Department of Science and Technology. Also, that if such a department is necessary, to recommend what Federal activities should be incorporated therein, and a determination made as to those which would better perform their allocated tasks as independent agencies or as components identified as an important function related to the mission of existing departments. These are among the major objectives of the proposal which I am submitting to the Senate today.

In view of our current fiscal difficulties, I am sure all of my colleagues are sympathetic to any measures which seek a balanced budget. Nevertheless, our science and technological programs must not be hampered or neglected. I submit that this measure should result in material savings through a freer exchange of ideas and a better coordination between the various Federal agencies dealing with science and technology.

It should eliminate much of the current duplicity of effort. I, therefore, urge enactment of this measure during the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 816) for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EASING EXCESSIVE SENTENCES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on January 31, 1963, the Washington Post published a thoughtful editorial on the problem of excessive sentences. It called attention to the historical pardoning power of the President to cure manifest injustices but appropriately questioned whether this is sufficient to cope with the chronic problem of sentence disparity.

I want to commend the editorial staff of the newspaper for pointing out the wisdom of examining alternative procedures, including appellate review of sentences, for the judicial system, in the words of the editorial, is "the best place to correct errors of judgment in the judicial system."

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for an appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States. It is identical to S. 2879 introduced by me in the 87th Congress and has already been the subject of intensive study by the Committee on the Administration of Criminal Laws of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The public encouragement to adopt such a measure offers additional hope that the Congress may soon take appropriate action. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to be inserted at this point in my remarks, together with the text of the bill introduced today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 823) to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after section 3741 thereof, the following new section:

"§ 3742. Appeal from sentence

"(a) In every case arising in a district court of the United States in which a defendant has been convicted of a criminal offense and sentenced to imprisonment for a term of five years or more, the defendant may, upon application to the United States court of appeals for the appropriate circuit made by the defendant within ten days after the date of entry of the judgment imposing sentence upon him, appeal from the sentence so imposed upon the ground that the sentence, although within lawful limits, is excessive. Upon the making of such application, the clerk of the district court and the appropriate United States attorney shall certify to the court of appeals such transcripts of proceedings, records, and other information relating to the offense of the defendant and the sentence imposed upon him as the court of appeals by rule or order may require, including any presentence reports or other evaluations made pursuant to statute relating to the defendant. The court of appeals shall take such appropriate measures as may be necessary to safeguard the secrecy of any such presentence reports and other evaluations. Any district judge imposing a sentence subject to review under this section shall state as part of the record his reason for imposing that particular sentence.

"(b) Any such appeal may be determined by the court of appeals with or without hearing thereon. On any such appeal, the appellate court may reduce the sentence imposed by the district court to any lawful sentence which it deems appropriate, if it determines that the conviction was proper, but that the sentence imposed was more severe than warranted by the circumstances of the case. By taking an appeal from the sentence under this section, the defendant shall waive any right to plead that as a result of any revision of the sentence by the appellate court he has been twice put in jeopardy for the same offense."

(b) The analysis of chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3742. Appeal from sentence."

The editorial presented by Mr. HRUSKA is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1963]

EASING EXCESSIVE SENTENCES

President Kennedy has made good use of his pardoning power to reduce excessive sentences imposed on persons convicted of crime. Increased vigilance on the part of the Department of Justice has made it possible to rescue a larger number of prisoners from the consequences of injustice. Yet it is apparent that the pardoning power of the President is not an effective means of systematically screening sentences with the object of modifying those found to be excessive.

Prison authorities and others have long been worried about the extreme variations in sentences imposed by different judges for similar crimes. Some improvements have been made by the sentencing institutes held for judges in recent years, but these touch only one aspect of the problem. In a recent case here in Washington the U.S. court of appeals took the unusual course of recommending a reduction of sentence to a district court judge. The appellate court has no authority to override the judgment of the lower court as to the severity of the sentence.

Legislation is being discussed to give the courts of appeals authority to review sentences as they now review the legality of trials. This seems to us wholly desirable as a means of providing a check against overly severe punishment. The best place to correct errors of judgment in the judicial system is in the judicial system itself before sentences actually begin.

One other reform is worthy of thoughtful consideration. The Armed Services now have a Military Board of Review, which each year systematically reexamines every sentence that is being served by military personnel. The result is drastic reduction of some excessive sentences as well as shortening of punishment for men who show evidence of rehabilitation. The possibility of having a sentence curtailed is said to give a powerful incentive to military prisoners to correct their conduct and to demonstrate a responsible attitude.

A board of review for the civilian prison system would seem to be in order. Perhaps the parole boards could perform this function. In any event, it is evident that the country needs to look beyond the increased use of the pardon power to guard against excessive sentences and to offer maximum incentives for prisoner rehabilitation.

ASSISTANCE FOR AMERICA'S VITAL GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of my junior colleague from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which seeks to do something constructive for the most seriously handicapped industry in America, the gold mining industry. No other industry in this country is compelled by law to sell its product at the price which prevailed in 1933, while at the same time it endeavors to conduct its activities and to pay its costs in terms of the steadily increasing inflationary prices which have prevailed in this country since 1933.

For all practical purposes, the commercial gold mining of any consequence still done in the United States is conducted in the Black Hills of South Dakota, although a few struggling mines are still trying to produce gold in Alaska, California, and elsewhere. Because of the disparity which has occurred from being compelled to sell the product at the 1933 price level of $35 an ounce, at a time when the costs of production have risen so sharply and steadily after 30 years, most of the other gold mining ventures in the country have closed down. Fair treatment of the gold mining industry would, however, open many commercial gold mines in additional States where the gold deposits are neither as rich nor as available as in South Dakota's fabulous Black Hills.

We read constantly about the financial challenge which this country confronts by virtue of the drainage of gold from the storage deposits at Fort Knox, Ky. Instead of being replenished by the process of mining gold from the rich veins of the Black Hills of South Dakota and from other areas and transporting it to safekeeping by the Government in the mountain fastnesses of Fort Knox, Ky., the process is in reverse, in that foreign demands upon our gold are steadily decreasing the amount which is stored by the Government at Fort Knox.

I submit that no greater economic challenge, no greater challenge in the fiscal field, confronts the Kennedy administration than to do something constructive toward reopening gold mines as a profitable venture in the United States. We have many potential gold mines in our country but after three decades the time has come when private capital can no longer continue to produce gold for the American public and for this Republic at a loss. Even from South Dakota's rich gold mines our source of supply is being curtailed and our continued supply seriously jeopardized by prevailing unfair discrimination against gold mining.

Since the need for gold is urgent today, and the means are at hand to do something useful and constructive to stimulate gold production, I direct the attention of Congress and the administration to the proposed legislation which the junior Senator from South Dakota and I are introducing today. Because the bill is only about 120 words in length, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed as part of my remarks. I sincerely hope constructive action will be forthcoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 824) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold produced in the United States, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 613(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that in the case of gold mines, such allowance shall not exceed 65 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income from the property (computed without allowance for depletion)".

SEC. 2. Section 613(b)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to mines and other natural deposits entitled to 23 percent rate of percentage depletion) is amended by inserting "gold," after "columbium,".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

RESEARCH ON AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would require the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct a program of research in aircraft noise abatement techniques. The need for this legislation is self-evident to the millions of Americans who live anywhere in the neighborhood of any of our larger airports. Last year, the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on my bill. It won the endorsement of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the Airport Operators Council. It was favorably reported by the Senate Commerce Committee, and was passed by the Senate late in the last session. Unfortunately, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not take action on the bill during that session. But in the meantime there have been significant developments.

Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Agency has at last clearly indicated that in the long run the only solution to the aircraft problem is a program of more research. Whereas last year, the Federal Aviation Agency had opposed my bill, on the ground that it did not need authority to undertake such research. In December the Deputy General Counsel of the Agency made clear that the bill "wouldn't hurt," and might be helpful in emphasizing the importance of Federal activities in this field.

Certainly there is an increasing public demand for full recognition by the Federal Government, by the airport operators, and by the airlines of the tremendous extent of the aircraft noise problem particularly in areas where jet planes are coming into use. When the bill was introduced last year, it was the first attempt to give the Federal Aviation Agency legal responsibility and impetus to accelerate research in this field. Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN sponsored the bill in the House of Representatives. This year, many bills similar in language and purpose have been introduced in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will act promptly on this bill. It is also my hope that, spurred by the wide public response, the House of Representatives will act promptly on this measure.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the bill and an article written by Robert Hochstein, and published in the Long Island Daily Press.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 825) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 312 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"NOISE ABATEMENT RESEARCH

"(d) The Administrator shall conduct, and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to, other appropriate public or private agencies or organizations in the conduct of research to determine means for establishing practical aircraft noise criteria and for abating objectionable aircraft noise.

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Administrator may make grants, contracts, or other arrangements without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529 and 41 U.S.C. 5)."

The article presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

[From the Long Island Daily Press, Dec. 7, 1962]

RESEARCH NEEDED TO QUIET PLANES, PANEL AGREES

(By Robert Hochstein)

Three days of hearings on the problem of aircraft noise abatement ended here yesterday with Congressmen, local government, and Federal aviation officials all asserting the need for additional research to find a solution.

Democratic Congressmen JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, of Ozone Park, and BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of Elmhurst, said the sessions have shown a clear-cut need for more concentrated Federal research into the noise problem.

James Hill, Deputy General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency, told the House Commerce Committee conducting the panel hearings that, in the long run, the only solution to aircraft noise is more research work.

The FAA official, reversing an earlier Agency stand, said passage of legislation sponsored by Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, authorizing FAA to undertake research, "wouldn't hurt." The FAA earlier had been on record against the measure, contending it already had necessary authority to conduct studies.

Hill also suggested the Federal Airport Act be amended to require zoning around airports. Presently, FAA can only recommend zoning.

Sidney Goldstein, general counsel of the New York Port Authority, told the committee that the Federal Government should participate in finding a solution to the noise problem, "especially by directing and conducting research."

He also urged more vigorous FAA enforcement of noise abatement procedures.

Another Goldstein recommendation was that Federal airport aid funds be employed for partial reimbursement of local authorities for payments resulting from damage claims brought by residents near airports.

"The FAA does not intend to assist in payment of damage claims," Hill flatly retorted.

It was noted during the session that 808 plaintiffs have filed a $5 million suit against 39 airlines and the New York Port Authority, claiming damages as a result of proximity to Idlewild Airport.

Goldstein said property owners have the "inherent right to compel an airport operator to conduct his operations so as not to constitute a nuisance."

ADDABBO and ROSENTHAL, who have been sitting in on the discussions, said after yesterday's session they plan to introduce an amendment to the FAA Act requiring the Agency to certify an engine as to its noise standard, as well as safety.

Hill said earlier he did not think the Agency has a right to refuse to certificate an engine because it made too much noise.

The two Long Island lawmakers said the drive to find quieter engines started many years ago, "and even today work is barely limping along with minimum Federal funds."

The FAA, according to testimony Tuesday by its Director, Najeeb Halaby, is currently spending $1.5 million annually on research in this field.

Another approach to the noise problem was offered by Leander I. Shelley, general counsel for the Airport Operator's Council.

"We feel," he said, "that the Federal Government should recognize its responsibility to provide rights-of-way to and from airports."

Shelley noted that in highway construction, and rivers and harbors operations, the Federal Government has taken this position.

However, Maj. Gen. Albert Kuhfeld, Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, said the military had conducted a study showing a $7 billion cost to acquire easements around its fields.

Hill of FAA said another survey showed it would cost $240 million to require the necessary easements for extending one La Guardia Airport runway. The property to be acquired was 400 feet by 1 mile.

Frederick G. Stickel, an attorney representing municipalities on zoning problems, said it was generally accepted that local municipalities cannot zone against a public body.

"But in a situation where airports are not established, or land around them is still

unused, municipalities can zone uses compatible with the airports," he said.

In cases where the areas surrounding airports are built up, a number of panelists at the hearing suggested an urban renewal program as a possible solution.

COMPETITION IN STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND MARKETS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators HUMPHREY, LAUSCHE, MORSE, and KEFAUVER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to introduce more competition into the State and municipal bond markets in order to reduce the interest rates States and municipalities must pay to finance capital improvements. It is substantially the same bill which I introduced last year, but with some improvements.

As of June 30, 1962, State and local indebtedness in the United States stood at $77.8 billion. This was an increase in total State and local indebtedness of over $5 billion since the same date in 1961.

Since 1946 mounting shortages in public services at State and local levels have pressed local financial resources to the limit, doubling the State and local percentage of the national public and private debt.

As a matter of interest, during the same period the Federal Government's share of the country's public and private debt declined by more than half. Clearly, in the face of dramatically increasing local government costs, any measure which tends to lighten the financial burden for governors and mayors is welcome.

This bill attempts to do exactly that.

The bill which I have introduced would authorize commercial banks to underwrite and deal in State and municipal revenue bonds.

At the present time, commercial banks may underwrite and deal in general obligation bonds—that is, the bonds which are secured by general revenue resources of the issuing State or local government—but they are barred from dealing in bonds which are backed only by earnings from governmental enterprises.

In consequence, a limited number of investment dealers have a private monopoly on the underwriting of revenue bond issues—which account for more than a third of all State and municipal bond financing—and a large part of the capital market goes untapped.

This exclusion, I submit, is based on conditions which existed in the bond market at the time of the passage of the Glass-Steagall National Banking Act of 1933—conditions which no longer exist today. During the intervening years the whole nature of revenue bond financing has changed radically.

Until the end of World War II, the volume of revenue bonds was relatively small and tended to be concentrated on certain unusual types of projects, such as toll bridges. Thus, with a number of exceptions, revenue bonds were considered greater risk investments than so-called general obligation bonds.

For a variety of reasons, there has been a major shift in municipal financing. More and more, new types of revenue bonds are being used in place of what once would have been general obligations. However, these revenue obligations are quite different from the former high-risk bonds. Basically they are general obligations in different form, and in previous years would have been called general obligations.

Today, for instance, many States have set up authorities which float bonds to build schools, office buildings, highways, bridges, water and electric plants, and so forth. The legislature then appropriates sufficient money to the authority out of general tax receipts to amortize the bonds. This type of revenue bond financing has increased sharply in recent years.

It is obvious from the legislative history of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 that the intent was to get the commercial banks out of promotional, speculative, developmental projects, and more specifically out of the corporate and foreign bond business. It was not until 1939 that the intent was to get the commercial banks out of promotional, speculative, developmental projects, and more specifically out of the corporate and foreign bond business. It was not until 1939 that "revenue bonds" were defined and a ruling made that the banks could not participate in such financing. As I have pointed out, the nature of revenue bond financing has altered sharply since then.

Subsequent developments have demonstrated that Congress has drawn the distinction in commercial bank bond participation between private and sound public financing. It has approved commercial bank activities in such high grade public bonds as those of local housing authorities and those issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the World Bank, Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, the Federal National Mortgage Association, home loan banks, and the bonds of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The proposed legislation permits commercial banks to underwrite, trade, and deal in municipal bonds only to the extent national banks can invest in such bonds under the National Banking Act. It provides the following safeguards:

First. The bonds must be of high quality with a proven record of earnings.

Second. They must be publicly offered, have satisfactory trustee arrangements and all other factors that make an issue qualify as a sound investment.

Third. The amount of bonds of one issue which a bank may own or be obligated to buy is limited to 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. The risk to the depositor is thus eliminated, since only a fractional percentage of the bank's capital funds, and not the depositor's funds, are involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the rising tide of State and local expenditures and the share of the load borne by general obligation and revenue bonds.

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

Year	Total new issues of State and municipal bonds	General obligation bonds	Revenue bonds
1945	$818,781,000	$615,381,750	$203,399,250
1950	3,693,604,000	3,093,681,000	599,923,200
1955	5,973,503,000	4,244,089,000	1,732,414,000
1960	7,229,500,000	5,034,680,000	2,194,820,000
1961	8,344,512,000	5,761,505,000	2,583,007,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 828) to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

POTATO MARKETING BILL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for supply management of Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk through February 28, to allow other Senators the opportunity to join in cosponsoring this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 829) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the bill which I am introducing today is the result of recommendations by the National Potato Advisory Committee, a 29-member group drawn from all segments of the potato industry in all areas of the country. Last year this committee recommended similar legislation, which I introduced as S. 3050. Today's bill is a revision of S. 3050. I want to take this opportunity to commend Secretary of Agriculture Freeman for continuing the committee and the potato industry for its cooperation in working out a proposal for the potato economy. I am proud of the role my State's representatives have played in its deliberations.

Since S. 3050 was introduced last year conditions in the potato industry have not improved. The Department of Agriculture has undertaken a diversion program for the 1962–63 marketing year, and there is ample evidence that a substantial surplus of potatoes exists nationwide. The Potato Advisory Committee's action indicates its continuing

concern with the problem of surplus production, and its recognition of the fact that individual areas cannot cope with the problem by themselves. The revisions in the present bill represent their best judgment on improvements in the management of the program.

The advisory committee proposal involves supply management through acreage allotments, if approved by farmers in a referendum.

Two points should be stressed in connection with this program: First, it involves industry self-help; and, second, it does not include price supports.

My concern for the potato industry is quite natural. Potatoes represent a major factor in Maine's agricultural economy, and they are the dominant commodity in Aroostook County, Maine. But the potato industry is a boom-and-bust economy, marked by wide variations in prices paid to farmers from year to year and within a marketing year. The last 2 years have been particularly difficult for Maine farmers and for farmers in other parts of the country.

Two years ago I asked the Department of Agriculture to undertake an economic study of the potato industry. I had been concerned to find that there was no general analysis available of the industry and its problems.

In response to my request, Secretary Freeman directed Agricultural Economics Director Willard W. Cochrane to make such a study. That study has been published. It is most instructive.

During the past 50 years there have been massive changes in the potato industry involving—as the USDA study points out—"sharply declining per capita consumption, rapidly increasing specialization and concentration of production, greatly improved breeding and cultural methods, and significant changes in utilization and marketing practices."

In the period between 1920 and 1961 yield per acre almost tripled; at the same time acreage declined almost 60 percent. The result was an almost stable trend in total production. Production increased from 223 million to 274 million hundredweight, or less than one fourth. We might have assumed that with our rapidly expanding population there would have been a corresponding increase in the consumption of potatoes. There was no such increase. In 1910, per capita consumption of potatoes was 198 pounds. By 1950, per capita consumption had dropped to 105 pounds. Total consumption for food dropped from 180 million hundredweight for a population of 92 million in 1910 to 165 million hundredweight for a population of 150 million in 1950.

In the past decade the downward trend in per capita consumption has been halted, and there has been a modest increase in total consumption. But the inelasticity of demand for potatoes has resulted in wide fluctuations in prices.

The Department's economic report pointed out that:

> During the last decade a 1-percent change in production of potatoes resulted on the average, in a 4 to 5 percent change in prices to growers. Because of this highly inelastic demand for potatoes, year-to-year variations in production, although usually moderate, exert tremendous influences on prices and income. These variations in production during the last decade average about 8 percent. About 60 percent of the year-to-year variation in production was due to changes in acreage, and 40 percent was due to variation in yield.

When we compare the price variations in potatoes with other commodities, we can see how serious the problem is. Again I quote from the departmental study:

> During the last decade, year-to-year variations in prices received for potatoes around the general farm price level averaged 47 percent. This was 5 to 8 times the price variation for most field crops, and compared with 16 percent for hogs, and 11 percent for beef cattle. The problem of sharply fluctuating and frequently low prices and income has been more serious as farms have become larger and more highly capitalized.

The large capital investment and operating capital requirements of today's larger farms have greatly increased the risks for individual farmers in years of low prices.

It should be noted that low farm prices do not mean substantially lower consumer prices. The Agriculture Department study indicates that a 10-percent drop in retail prices will result in a 30-percent drop in the price to the grower.

Obviously it is to the advantage of the grower, the processor, the marketer, and the consumer of potatoes to stabilize prices.

One means of price stabilization involves increased demand through quality improvement, processing a variety of potato products, and aggressive marketing techniques. This is being done by the industry, with some success.

The second technique involves the use of marketing agreements to control the quality of table-use potatoes and to introduce a measure of supply management. This is being done by a large segment of the industry. An effort is being made to extend marketing agreements to cover the entire country.

The third approach is the potato acreage allotment bill. This is the legislation I have introduced today.

The bill provides for the appointment by the Secretary of Agriculture of a National Potato Advisory Board, representing commercial potato growers. In addition, the Secretary may appoint State or area advisory committees of commercial potato growers.

Under the terms of the proposal, the Secretary of Agriculture, when he determines that the total supply of potatoes is likely to exceed in the next marketing year the normal supply of potatoes, shall proclaim, prior to January 1, a national marketing quota for the purpose of computing the national acreage allotment. Prior to February 1, the proposed national quota would be submitted to farmers for a secret ballot referendum.

In order for the acreage allotment to take effect, at least two-thirds of the farmers voting, or 50 percent of the farmers voting and representing two-thirds or more of the acreage planted by the farmers voting, must approve the national quota.

The national acreage allotment under this legislation would be determined by dividing the quota by the national average yield per acre in the 2 highest yield years of the 3 crop years preceding the year in which the quota is proclaimed. State and farm acreage allotments would be established on the basis of the 2 highest production years of the 3 preceding crop years. A one-half of 1 percent acreage reserve would be established for new producers. Minimum acreage allotments would be set at 2 acres.

Farmers would be permitted to market all potatoes produced on their acreage allotment, but would be assessed at $2 per hundredweight or 75 percent of the June 1 parity, whichever is higher, penalty on the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess would be computed as the average yield per acre for the farm multiplied by the acres planted in excess of the acreage allotment.

Mr. President, this legislation would establish a supply management program based on farmer approval, and geared to the needs and marketing opportunities of the industry. I want to stress the fact that the central feature of this bill is the acreage allotment. The marketing quota referred to in the bill is simply a statistical device designed to set the basis for acreage allotments. Farmers would not be told how much they could market.

I believe this proposal represents a reasonable approach to the potato problem which deserves thoughtful consideration. I hope that we will be able to hold hearings on the legislation in the near future. I shall welcome the support and assistance of my colleagues who wish to cosponsor the bill with me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 829

A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments

Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after part VII of subtitle B thereof the following new part:

"PART VIII—MARKETING QUOTAS—IRISH POTATOES

"Legislative findings

"SEC. 360m. Potatoes are a basic source of food for the Nation and are produced throughout the United States by nearly seven hundred thousand producers. Potatoes are marketed on a nationwide market and owing to causes beyond their control, farmers producing the commodity and persons engaged in the marketing thereof are unable to regulate effectively the orderly marketing of the commodity.

"Potatoes are produced and marketed in six distinct seasonal groups. Of these, the winter, early spring, late spring, and early summer crops are highly perishable and must be marketed upon harvest. The fall crop can be stored for eight to ten months and to some extent the late summer crop can be stored for several months. Demand for potatoes is relatively inelastic so that a

small change in supply has a large effect on producers. Thus, even a moderate oversupply in a particular season seriously depresses prices to growers in that season, and often in the succeeding season or seasons. Under such conditions, prices received by producers often are below the cost of production.

"The marketing of abnormally excessive and abnormally deficient supplies of potatoes acutely and directly affects, burdens, and obstructs interstate and foreign commerce. Abnormally excessive supplies overtax the facilities of interstate and foreign transportation, congest terminal markets, depress the price of potatoes in interstate and foreign commerce, and otherwise disrupt the orderly marketing of such commodity in such commerce. Such surpluses also result in disastrously low prices of potatoes to producers, destroy the purchasing power of such producers for industrial products, and reduce the value of the agricultural assets supporting the national credit structure. Abnormally deficient supplies result in an inadequate flow of potatoes and potato products in interstate and foreign commerce with accompanying injurious effects to the instrumentalities of such commerce and with excessive increases in the price of potatoes and potato products in interstate and foreign commerce. Such shortages also result in unreasonably high prices for potatoes and potato products to consumers and the loss of market outlets for potato producers.

"It is in the interest of the general welfare and the purpose of this part to protect interstate and foreign commerce in potatoes and potato products from such burdensome surpluses and distressing shortages, and to make potatoes available in adequate volume to meet domestic consumption and export requirements without impairing or wasting the soil resources of the country.

"The entire production of potatoes is available for marketing in interstate and foreign commerce. All marketing of potatoes is either in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or directly burdens, obstructs, or affects such commerce. The marketing of that portion of such commodity which enters directly into the current of interstate and foreign commerce cannot be effectively regulated without extending the regulation, in the manner provided in this part, also to that portion which is consumed within the State of production.

"Advisory boards

"SEC. 360n. (a) The Secretary shall appoint a national advisory board to be designated as the 'National Potato Advisory Board', the membership of which shall consist of commercial potato growers or their representatives.

"The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary relating to the nomination of candidates for appointment, the functions of the Board, and the terms of office of the members. If a national potato administrative board is appointed for use in connection with a national potato marketing order, such board, or a part of the members thereof as determined by the Secretary, may be utilized as the National Potato Advisory Board. The National Potato Advisory Board shall meet at the call of the Secretary no less than twice a year, and shall advise with and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the administration of this part.

"(b) The Secretary shall appoint an advisory committee of commercial potato growers in each commercial potato producing State and he may appoint a similar advisory committee in each of the other States or separate production areas within each State if requested to do so by commercial potato producers within that State. For the purpose of this section a commercial potato producing State shall be any State which (1) had a production exceeding 2.5 million hundredweight in any of the three years immediately preceding the calendar year in which marketing quotas are proclaimed, or (2) had one or more counties producing one-half million hundredweight or more as shown in the last census of agriculture.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to pay members of the National Potato Advisory Board and of State advisory committees for each day's attendance at meetings and while traveling to and from such meetings, transportation expenses, and, in lieu of subsistence, a per diem in the amount authorized under the Travel Expense Act of 1949 for Federal employees. No salary or other compensation shall be paid.

"National marketing quota

"SEC. 360o. (a) Whenever prior to January 1 of any marketing year the Secretary determines that the total supply of potatoes for the next marketing year will, in the absence of a national marketing quota, be likely to exceed the normal supply of potatoes for such marketing year by such amount as will make a marketing quota necessary to effectuate the purpose of this part, the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for such year. Such quota shall be applicable to the crop of potatoes produced for marketing in such marketing year. The crop of potatoes produced for marketing in any marketing year shall be deemed to be the crop of potatoes produced in the crop year beginning immediately prior to the beginning of such marketing year from the six seasonal groups of potatoes known as late summer, fall, winter, early spring, late spring, and early summer. Potatoes of a crop to which a national marketing quota for any marketing year is applicable shall be subject to the quota notwithstanding that they may be marketed prior to the beginning of or subsequent to the close of such marketing year.

"(b) If the Secretary proclaims a national marketing quota for any marketing year, he shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of such quota. The amount of the national marketing quota for any marketing year shall be an amount of potatoes, which when added to the estimated imports and the estimated production by producers producing not in excess of two acres of potatoes will make available a supply of potatoes of the crop to which the quota applies equal to the normal supply of potatoes for such marketing year.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may, at the time of the proclamation, under this part, of a national marketing quota for potatoes produced in the 1964–1965 crop year in addition proclaim a marketing quota to be applicable to one or more seasonable groups of potatoes which will be produced in the 1963–1964 crop year, excluding the late summer and fall groups, to which he determines it will be administratively feasible to apply the provisions of this part: *Provided*, That the marketing quota proclaimed in such additional proclamation shall not be applicable to any seasonal group listed below unless such proclamation is issued on or before the date indicated below for such group and unless the referendum under section 360p is held not later than one month following such date:

"(a) Winter—May 1, 1963;
"(b) Early spring—September 1, 1963;
"(c) Late spring—September 1, 1963; and
"(d) Early summer—October 1, 1963.

"If such an additional proclamation is issued, State marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be determined for the seasonal group or groups to which the marketing quota proclaimed in such additional proclamation is applicable, but for the purposes of such quota the acreage allotment for any producer who produced one or more of such seasonal groups during the base period used for establishing allotments for the purpose of the marketing quota for potatoes produced in the 1964–1965 crop year shall be the same as the acreage allotment established for the producer under section 360r of this Act for the purpose of such marketing quota: *Provided*, That if more than one seasonal group was produced by any such producer during such base period, the acreage allotment for such producer for potatoes produced in the 1963–1964 crop year shall be such proportion of the producer acreage allotment for potatoes produced in the 1964–1965 crop year as the average acreage planted by the producer to the seasonal group or groups covered by the marketing quota proclaimed in the additional proclamation bears to the average acreage planted on the farm to all seasonal groups during the two years of highest acreage of the three base years used to establish acreage allotments under section 360r for potatoes produced in the 1964–1965 crop year. The referendum held under section 360p for the national marketing quota proclaimed for potatoes produced in the 1964–1965 crop year shall be limited to the question whether the farmers favor such quota and also the national marketing quota proclaimed in such additional proclamation.

"Referendum

"SEC. 360p. Not later than February 1 following the issuance of a proclamation under 360o, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers who were engaged in the production of more than two acres of potatoes during at least one of the two crop years (excluding the 1961–1962 and 1962–1963 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups and the 1962–1963 and 1963–1964 crop years in the case of late summer, fall, and winter seasonal groups) immediately preceding the crop year in which the referendum is held to determine whether such farmers approve or disapprove the national marketing quota so proclaimed. In addition, the Secretary may also submit in the referendum the question of whether such farmers approve or disapprove a national marketing quota for the three marketing years beginning with the marketing year for which the quota was proclaimed. A national marketing quota shall be in effect for the marketing year or years for which a quota has been or later is proclaimed under section 360o if the Secretary determines that such quota was approved by two-thirds or more of the farmers voting in the referendum or at least 50 per centum of the farmers voting and two-thirds or more of the total acreage represented by the farmers voting in the referendum based upon the acreage planted in the immediately preceding crop year (excluding the 1961–1962 and 1962–1963 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups, and the 1962–1963 and 1963–1964 crop years in the case of late summer, fall, and winter seasonal groups). If a national marketing quota for three marketing years is so approved by farmers no referendum shall be held for the second or third year for which a marketing quota is proclaimed by the Secretary under section 360o(a). The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within thirty days after the date of such referendum.

"State marketing quotas and State acreage allotments

"SEC. 360q. (a) The national marketing quota for any marketing year, less the amount reserved under subsections (c) and (d) of section 360r, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of potatoes in each State during the two years of highest production of the three crop years (excluding the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups, and the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of late

summer, fall, and winter seasonal groups) immediately preceding the crop year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, exclusive of the production in any such year by producers having two acres or less of potatoes, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary to make correction for abnormal conditions affecting production.

"(b) The State marketing quota for any marketing year shall be converted to a State acreage allotment for the crop of potatoes produced for market in such year by dividing such quota by the average yield per acre of potatoes in the State during the two years of highest yields of the three crop years immediately preceding the crop year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments in such yield as the Secretary determines necessary to correct for current trends in yields and for abnormal conditions affecting yields in such period.

"Apportionment of State acreage allotment

"SEC. 360r. (a) The State acreage allotment for any crop of potatoes, less the reserve established under subsection (d) hereof, shall be apportioned by the Secretary through the State and county committees to farms in the State on which there will be person or persons engaged in the production of potatoes who have produced potatoes in the State in any one of the three crop years (excluding the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups, and the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of other seasonal groups) immediately preceding the year for which such apportionment is made on the basis of the average acreage of potatoes planted in the State by such producer(s) in the two highest of the three crop years (excluding the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups, and the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of other seasonal groups) immediately preceding the crop year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as he determines necessary for land, labor, and equipment available for the production of potatoes, crop-rotation practices, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered in order to provide fair and equitable allotments. In States where potatoes of more than one seasonal group are produced, separate farm acreage allotments (and marketing quotas) may be established as provided above for each such seasonal group.

"(b) If the Secretary determines that the establishment of separate production areas in any State will facilitate the effective administration of the Act and if separate data are available for such purpose, he may establish separate production areas in such State, and the word "State" as used in this part shall, be deemed to mean "production area," wherever applicable.

"(c) The Secretary shall establish a reserve of not in excess of one-half of one per centum of the national marketing quota, which shall be converted to acreage on the basis of the national average yield per acre of potatoes during the two years of highest yields of the three crop years immediately preceding the crop year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments in such yield as the Secretary determines necessary to correct for current trends in yields and for abnormal conditions affecting yields in such period. Such reserve shall be available (1) to provide acreage allotments for persons who did not produce potatoes in any of the three crop years (excluding the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups and the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of other seasonal groups) immediately preceding the crop year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed; and (2) to provide additional allotment for producers whose allotments are inequitable because (i) they produced potatoes in only one year of the three-year base period or (ii) their acreages during such period were abnormally low for some cause beyond their control or (iii) they need additional allotment to utilize equipment acquired prior to 1962. Such allotments for producers under (1) above shall be based on such factors as the Secretary determines should be considered in order to establish fair and equitable allotments including but not limited to one or more of the following factors: The availability of land, labor, and equipment for the production of potatoes, the past experience and investment prior to 1962 of the producer in the production of potatoes, and the dependency of the producer on income from farming for his livelihood.

"(d) For the first full crop year for which acreage allotments are in effect under this part, the Secretary shall establish an additional reserve of not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the national marketing quota, converted to acreage as provided in subsection (c) plus a reserve of not to exceed 1½ per centum of the State acreage allotment which shall be used for the purpose of providing additional acreage for use as provided in item (2) of subsection (c) of this section. That part of such additional reserve as is deducted from the State allotment of any State shall be used only within such State.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this part—

"(1) No noncommercial producer shall be considered to have produced potatoes for the purpose of determining the eligibility for an acreage allotment under subsection (a) of this section;

"(2) a noncommercial producer shall be a producer whose average acreage planted to potatoes during the two crop years in which the highest acreages were planted of the three crop years used in determining producer allotments is two acres or less;

"(3) no allotment shall be established for any producer under this section which, if established, would be two acres or less;

"(4) the acreage of potatoes produced by any noncommercial producer on any farm for which an acreage allotment is established shall be considered as acreage of potatoes for the purpose of determining the farm marketing quota and farm marketing excess for such farm;

"(5) any acreage planted to potatoes on any farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be considered in establishing future producer allotments.

"(f) The provisions of section 377 of this Act shall not be applicable to this part but any farm on which an acreage of potatoes equal to 90 per centum or more of the farm acreage allotment was planted (or was regarded as planted under the provisions of the Soil Bank Act or the Great Plains program) shall be deemed to have an acreage of potatoes equal to the farm acreage allotment for the purpose of establishing future State and producer allotments.

"Amount of farm marketing quota

"SEC. 360s. The farm marketing quota for any crop of potatoes shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to such crop on the farm less the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess shall be an amount equal to the normal yield of potatoes per acre established for the farm multiplied by the number of acres of potatoes of such crop on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such crop. For the purpose only of determining the farm marketing quota and farm marketing excess, a farm for which no allotment is established shall be deemed to have an allotment of two acres. If separate farm acreage allotments are established for any seasonal group of potatoes such seasonal group shall be considered as a separate crop for the purposes of determining the farm marketing quota and farm marketing excess under this part.

"Compliance

"SEC. 360t. (a) Whenever farm marketing quotas are in effect for any crop of potatoes, the producers on the farm shall be subject to a penalty on the farm marketing excess at a rate equal to $2 per hundredweight of potatoes: *Provided,* That beginning with the crop of potatoes produced in the 1964–1965 crop year, if 75 per centum of the parity price of potatoes as of June 1 of the crop year preceding the crop year in which such crop of potatoes was produced exceeds $2, such rate of penalty shall be increased to 75 per centum of such parity price.

"(b) The farm marketing excess shall be regarded as available for marketing, and the penalty shall be computed upon the normal production of the excess acreage.

"(c) Each person entitled to share in the crop of potatoes on which the penalty was incurred or in the proceeds thereof shall be jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of the penalty on the farm marketing excess.

"(d) Until the producers on any farm pay the penalty on the farm marketing excess of any crop of potatoes, any crop of potatoes subject to marketing quotas in which the producer liable for payment of the penalty has an interest shall be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for the amount of the penalty.

"(e) Until the penalty on the farm marketing excess is paid, each hundredweight of potatoes produced on the farm shall be subject to the penalty specified in subsection (a) of this section, and such penalty on each hundredweight of potatoes which is sold by the producer to any person within the United States shall be paid by the buyer, who may deduct an amount equivalent to the penalty from the price paid to the producer. If the buyer fails to collect such penalty, such buyer and all persons entitled to share in the potatoes marketed from the farm or the proceeds thereof shall be jointly and severally liable for such penalty.

"(f) The persons liable for the payment or collection of the penalty on any amount of potatoes shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"(g) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation to pay the penalty on the farm marketing excess for any crop of potatoes on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of the potatoes of such crop produced on the farm for which such farm marketing excess is determined is sold or exchanged for goods and services or otherwise marketed from such farm or removed from the farm except for use as human food by the producers or members of their families or households;

"(2) That the entire production on such farm of such crop of potatoes is used by the producers or members of their families or households for human food or used for seed or feed for livestock owned by any of the producers of such crop or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of the producer as determined by the

Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if the exemption had not been granted. No producer exempted under this subsection shall be eligible to vote in the referendum held under section 360p with respect to a marketing quota applicable to potatoes produced in the next subsequent crop year.

"Transfer of allotments and acreage history

"SEC. 360u. (a) Allotments made to producers under the provisions of section 360r of this Act may be transferred in whole or in part by sale, lease or gift, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, which shall include the following:

"(1) No producer shall be permitted to transfer all his allotment hereunder unless he agrees to withdraw from the production of potatoes for the crop year in which the transfer is effective, and for one crop year after such transfer;

"(2) The production of potatoes on a leased allotment shall be deemed to be the production of the lessor for the purpose of potato acreage history; and

"(3) A transfer by sale or gift of an allotment shall be accompanied by a transfer of the potato acreage history upon which such allotment is based, and a transfer by any of the foregoing means may be made only to a person with experience in producing potatoes.

"(b) If a producer dies, his potato acreage history shall be apportioned in whole or in part as provided by will or, in the absence thereof, among his heirs according to the extent to which they may continue, or have continued, his farming operations, if satisfactory proof of such succession of farming operations is furnished the Secretary.

"(c) Upon the dissolution of a partnership, the partnership's potato acreage history shall be divided among the partners in such proportion as agreed upon in writing by the partners, or in the absence of such an agreement, among the partners in such proportion as determined to be fair and equitable by the Secretary taking into consideration the contribution, if any, of potato acreage history to the partnership by each partner and the share of each partner in the partnership.

"(d) Application for transfer of allotments and acreage history hereunder shall be made at such time and in such manner, and shall be supported by such information and data, as may be required under regulations issued by the Secretary."

"Adjustment and termination

"SEC. 360v. Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, if after the proclamation of a national marketing quota for potatoes for any marketing year, the Secretary has reason to believe that farm marketing quotas in effect for potatoes will cause the amount of potatoes which is free of marketing restrictions to be less than the normal supply for the marketing year then current, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made with respect thereto. If on the basis of such investigation the Secretary finds the existence of such fact, he may proclaim the same forthwith and may specify such increase in, or termination of, existing quotas on a seasonal group basis or for the entire crop to which the quota applies as he finds necessary to make the amount of potatoes which is free of marketing restrictions equal to normal supply. In case of any increase under this section, the Secretary shall provide for such increase by increasing acreage allotments by a uniform percentage.

"Applicability of part

"SEC. 360w. This part VIII shall apply only to the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the word "corn" and inserting in lieu thereof "potatoes".

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (6)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"(6)(A) 'Market', in the case of cotton, rice, tobacco, wheat, and potatoes, means to dispose of, in raw or processed form, by voluntary or involuntary sale, barter, or exchange, or by gift inter vivos, and in the case of wheat, by feeding (in any form) to poultry or livestock which, or the products of which, are sold, bartered, or exchanged, or to be so disposed of."

(2) Paragraph (7) is amended by adding thereto the following: "Potatoes—August 15–August 14."

(3) Paragraph (9) is amended to read as follows:

"(9) 'Normal production' as applied to any number of acres of cotton, rice, wheat, or potatoes means the normal yield for the farm times such number of acres."

(4) Paragraph (10) is amended by adding a new subparagraph (D) as follows:

"(D) 'Normal supply' of potatoes for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated domestic consumption for the marketing year for which such normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for such marketing year, adjusted for surplus or deficiencies caused by changes in marketing conditions or carryover of potatoes and potato products. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he deems necessary. The Secretary shall make such further adjustments as he deems necessary to provide a supply of potatoes which will be needed and utilized in commercial channels during the marketing year at prices not in excess of the parity price but as near such maximum level as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, taking into consideration (i) the supply of potatoes in relation to the demand therefor, (ii) the importance of potatoes to agriculture and the national economy, (iii) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand, and (iv) the need of potato producers for a fair return on their labor and investment."

(5) Paragraph (13) is amended by adding a new subparagraph (H) as follows:

"(H) 'Normal yield' for any farm in the case of potatoes shall be the average yield per acre for the farm during the two crop years immediately preceding the year in which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions, for current trends in yields, and for changes in cultural practices. If for any such year the data are not available or there is no actual yield, then the normal yield for the farm shall be appraised in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, taking into consideration abnormal weather conditions, the normal yield for the county, and the yield in years for which data are available."

(6) Paragraph (16) is amended by adding a new subparagraph (D) as follows:

"(D) 'Total supply' of potatoes for any marketing year shall be the estimated production of potatoes in the United States during the crop year in which such marketing year begins, plus the estimated imports of potatoes into the United States during such marketing year, plus the carryover of potatoes including potatoes carried over in the form of potato products at the beginning of such marketing year."

(7) New paragraphs are added as follows:

"(17) 'Potatoes' means all varieties of Irish potatoes.

"(18) 'Normal yield' for any county in the case of potatoes shall be the average yield per acre for such county during the two crop years immediately preceding the crop year in which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions, for current trends in yields, and for changes in cultural practices.

"(19) 'Seasonal groups', in the case of potatoes, are:

"(A) 'Late summer'—the crop the bulk of which is usually harvested in the period August 16 through September 30.

"(B) 'Fall'—the crop the bulk of which is usually harvested in October, November, and December.

"(C) 'Winter'—the crop bulk of which is usually harvested in January, February, and March.

"(D) 'Early spring'—the crop the bulk of which is usually harvested in the period April 1 through May 15.

"(E) 'Late spring'—the crop the bulk of which is usually harvested in the period May 16 through June 30.

"(F) 'Early summer'—the crop the bulk of which is usually harvested in the period July 1 through August 15.

"(20) 'Crop year', in the case of potatoes, means the period, beginning with the planting of late summer potatoes, in which the six seasonal groups are produced and shall be designated by the two calendar years in which the potatoes planted in the crop year are harvested."

SEC. 4. Section 361 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 361. This part shall apply to the publication and review of farm marketing quotas established for tobacco, wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and potatoes, established under subtitle B."

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 371 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "or tobacco" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "tobacco, or potatoes".

SEC. 6. Subsection (a) of section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding "potatoes," after "cotton,".

SEC. 7. Sections 373, 374, and 375 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are hereby amended by deleting "corn" wherever it appears and by inserting in lieu thereof "potatoes"; and subsection (c) of section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "to any basic agricultural commodity on the farm" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "on the farm to any agricultural commodity for which acreage allotments or marketing quotas are established under subtitle B of this title."

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF POTATO MARKETING QUOTA BILL

Section 1 of the bill provides a new part to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize marketing quotas on Irish potatoes.

LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

Section 360m of such new part contains legislative findings, showing need for the legislation and providing a constitutional basis therefor under the commerce clause.

ADVISORY BOARDS

Section 360n provides for the nomination and appointment by the Secretary of a National Potato Advisory Board consisting of commercial potato growers or their representatives, to advise with and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the administration of the potato marketing quota program. If a national advisory board is appointed for use in connection with a national potato marketing order, all or part of the members of such board could be utilized as the National Potato Advisory Board. The Secretary is to also appoint State advisory committees. Such State advisory

committees would be mandatory in commercial potato-producing States (i.e., States producing more than 2.5 million hundredweight of potatoes or having one or more counties producing one-half million hundredweight or more of potatoes), permissive in all other States. Board and committee members are not to be paid but are to be reimbursed for travel and subsistence expenses.

NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA

Subsection (a) of section 360o provides that the Secretary shall, whenever, prior to January 1 of any marketing year, he determines that the total supply of potatoes for the next marketing year will, in the absence of a marketing quota program, be likely to be excessive, proclaim a national marketing quota for potatoes to be applicable to the crop of potatoes produced for market in such next marketing year. Such crop consists of potatoes produced from the six seasonal groups of potatoes known as late summer, fall, winter, early spring, late spring, and early summer.

Subsection (b) of section 360o provides for proclaiming the amount of the national marketing quota as the amount of potatoes which, when added to estimated imports and the estimated production by producers producing 2 acres or less, will make available a supply of potatoes equal to the normal supply.

Subsection (c) of section 360o authorizes the Secretary at the time he proclaims quotas on the 1964–65 crop of potatoes, if he determines it administratively feasible, to proclaim in addition a marketing quota to be applicable to one or more of the seasonal groups, excluding the late summer and fall crops, of the 1963–64 crop. The bill states the dates by which the proclamation for the 1964–65 crop would have to be made and the referendum under section 360p with respect thereto held in order for the Secretary to be able to include a seasonal group in the additional proclamation. In the event such an additional proclamation should be issued, the farm acreage allotments established for the 1964–65 crop would be used for the purposes of the quotas on the 1963–64 crop, modified as required to allot to farms the share of the full year's allotment attributable to plantings of the seasonal groups included in the additional proclamation. Subsection (c) also provides that the referendum to determine whether farmers favor marketing quotas in the 1964–65 crop of potatoes shall be limited to the one question of whether farmers favor quotas for both the 1964–65 crop and such of the seasonal groups of the 1963–64 crop as are included in the additional proclamation.

REFERENDUM

Section 360p provides for the holding of a referendum, by secret ballot, not later than the February 1 following the proclamation of a marketing quota on potatoes for the next marketing year to determine whether farmers favor or oppose the quota. The Secretary could also submit in any referendum (except the 1964–65 referendum, as stated in section 360o(c)) the question of whether farmers also approve or disapprove quotas for the 3 marketing years beginning with the year for which a marketing quota had been announced. A favorable vote of two-thirds or more of those voting or 50 percent of those voting and two-thirds or more of the acreage represented by those voting is required for the quota to become effective. Any farmer would be eligible to vote in a referendum if he was engaged in the production of more than 2 acres of potatoes during at least 1 of the 2 crop years immediately preceding the crop year in which the referendum is held. However, the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups and the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of the other seasonal groups would be excluded from the 2-year period in determining eligibility to vote.

The Secretary would be required to announce the results of any referendum within 30 days after the date of the referendum.

STATE MARKETING QUOTAS AND STATE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Section 360q(a) provides for the apportionment of the national marketing quota, less the national reserve provided for in subsections 360r (c) and (d), among the several States on the basis of the total production in the States during the 2 years of highest production of the immediately preceding 3 crop years (excluding the production of producers having 2 acres or less and excluding the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups and the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of other seasonal groups), with adjustments for abnormal conditions affecting production.

Section 360q(b) provides for the conversion of the State marketing quota into a State acreage allotment by dividing such quota by the average yield per acre of potatoes in the State during the 2 years of highest yields of the 3 crop years immediately preceding the crop year in which the national quota is proclaimed, with necessary adjustments for trends in yields and abnormal conditions affecting yields.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Section 360r(a) provides for the apportionment of the State acreage allotment, less a reserve of not to exceed 1½ percent of the State allotment in the first year quotas are in effect, among farms in the State on the basis of the acreages of potatoes planted in the State by producers on the farm during the 2 years of the 3 crop years immediately preceding the crop year in which the national quota is proclaimed in which the highest acreages were planted by them. In order that farmers may not, by increasing their plantings of potatoes before the bill goes into effect, obtain increased acreage allotments for future years, the planted acreages during the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups, and during the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of late summer, fall, and winter seasonal groups are excluded from the 3-year period. Appropriate adjustments in allotments are authorized for such factors as land, labor, and equipment available for the production of potatoes, crop-rotation practices, and other factors determined necessary to assure fair and equitable allotments. In States where potatoes are produced in more than one seasonal group, separate allotments for each seasonal group are authorized.

Subsection (b) of section 360r provides for the establishment of separate production areas in any State if separate statistical data are available and if the Secretary determines such establishment will facilitate effective administration of the act. If so established, each such production area would be deemed to be a State for purposes of the program.

Subsection (c) of section 360r provides that a reserve of not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the national marketing quota, converted to acreage on the basis of the national average yield of potatoes, shall be made available (1) for allotments to "new" producers, i.e., producers who did not produce potatoes in any of the immediately preceding 3 years (excluding the 1961–62 and 1962–63 crop years in the case of early spring, late spring, and early summer seasonal groups and the 1962–63 and 1963–64 crop years in the case of other seasonal groups from such 3-year period); and (2) to provide additional allotments to producers who receive inequitable allotments because (i) of short history of production, or (ii) of low planted acreages from some cause beyond the control of the producer, or (iii) of the purchase of machinery prior to 1962 which cannot be utilized. Such "new" allotments would be based on one or more factors such as availability of land, labor, and equipment for the production of potatoes, past experience, investment of the producer in equipment prior to 1962, on income derived from farming for his livelihood, and such other factors considered necessary to establish fair and equitable allotments.

Subsection (d) provides that for the first crop year acreage allotments are in effect, an additional reserve of not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the national marketing quota plus, for use in the State, not to exceed 1½ percent of each State's acreage allotment shall be made available for the same purpose as provided in clause (2), subsection (c), above.

Subsection (e) contains several paragraphs which apply to the establishment of potato allotments which in some particulars are in addition to, or differ from, provisions applicable to other commodities. These are:

Paragraph (1) provides that no noncommercial producer (defined in par. (2) below) shall be considered to have produced potatoes for the purpose of determining eligibility for an allotment under subsection (a) above.

Paragraph (2) defines a noncommercial producer as a producer whose average acreage planted to potatoes during the 2 crop years in which the highest acreages were planted of the 3 crop years used in determining allotments is 2 acres or less.

Paragraph (3) provides that no allotment shall be established for a producer which, if established, would be 2 acres or less.

Paragraph (4) provides that the acreage of potatoes produced by any noncommercial producer on a farm for which an acreage allotment is established shall be counted as potato acreage in determining compliance with the farm acreage allotment.

Paragraph (5) provides that any acreage planted to potatoes on any farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be considered in establishing future allotments to producers.

Subsection (f) provides that the provisions of section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which provides for automatic preservation of acreage history for any commodity subject to marketing quotas if 75 percent or more of the farm acreage allotment is planted during the current year or either of the 2 preceding years, shall not be applicable to potatoes; and that the potato farm acreage allotment shall be deemed to have been fully planted for the purposes of determining future State and producer acreage allotments if 90 percent or more of the farm acreage allotment for the current year is planted to potatoes.

AMOUNT OF THE FARM MARKETING QUOTA

Section 360s defines the farm marketing quota of potatoes as the actual production of potatoes planted on the farm less the farm marketing excess; and the farm marketing excess as an amount of potatoes equal to the normal yield per acre of potatoes times the number of acres planted in excess of the farm acreage allotment. In computing the farm marketing quota and farm marketing excess, a farm having no allotment shall be considered to have an allotment equal to 2 acres. It is also provided that if separate farm acreage allotments are determined for any seasonal group of potatoes, as authorized under section 360r(a), such seasonal group shall be considered as a separate crop for the purposes of determining the farm marketing quota.

COMPLIANCE

Subsection (a) of section 360t sets the rate of the marketing penalty on the farm marketing excess at $2 per hundredweight, and for an increase, beginning with the 1964–65 crop, to 78 percent of the parity price for potatoes if 75 percent of such parity price as of June 1 of the crop year exceeds $2.

Subsection (b) provides that penalty shall be computed upon the normal production of the excess acreage.

Subsection (c) provides that each person entitled to share in the crop of potatoes or proceeds thereof shall be jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of penalty incurred on such crop of potatoes.

Subsection (d) provides that until the penalty has been paid, any crop of potatoes subject to marketing quotas in which the producer liable for payment of the penalty has an interest shall be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for the amount of the penalty.

Subsection (e) provides that until the penalty on the farm marketing excess is paid each hundredweight of potatoes sold to any person in the United States shall be subject to penalty and the penalty collected by the buyer, who may deduct the amount of penalty from the price paid the producer. If the buyer fails to collect the penalty, he and all persons entitled to share in the potatoes produced on the farm or proceeds thereof shall be jointly and severally liable for the penalty.

Subsection (f) provides for interest at 6 percent per annum on unpaid penalties.

Subsection (g) provides that the producers on any farm may obtain an exemption from marketing quotas if they make application therefor, market no potatoes from the farm, and use the entire production of potatoes for food for the producers, their families, and households, or for seed or feed for livestock owned by any producer on the farm or by a subsequent owner or operator of the farm. Failure to comply with the conditions governing the exemption will cause the exemption to become null and void unless the failure is due to circumstances beyond the producer's control. Any producer obtaining such an exemption will not be eligible to vote in the referendum held on the next crop of potatoes.

TRANSFER OF ALLOTMENTS AND ACREAGE HISTORY

Subsection (a) of section 360u makes provision for the transfer of allotments from one producer to another. (Section 353(f) of the 1938 Act (Public Law 87–412) permits transfer of rice allotments under certain conditions.)

Paragraph (1) of the subsection provides that a producer cannot transfer all his allotment unless he withdraws from the production of potatoes for the crop year in which the transfer becomes effective, and for one crop year after such transfer.

Paragraph (2) specifies that the production of potatoes on a leased allotment shall be deemed to be the production of the lessor for the purpose of potato acreage history.

Paragraph (3) provides that a transfer by sale or gift shall be accompanied by a transfer of the potato acreage history, and that, with respect to any transfer made under subsection (a), the transferee must be a person with experience in producing potatoes.

Subsection (b) of section 360u provides for a decedent's potato acreage history being apportioned as provided by will or, in the absence of a will, among those heirs who continue the decendent's farming operations.

Subsection (c) of section 360u contains a procedure for the transfer of history acreage upon the dissolution of a partnership.

Subsection (d) of section 360u provides that transfers of allotments and acreage history shall be made at such time and be supported by such information as may be required under regulations issued by the Secretary.

ADJUSTMENT AND TERMINATION

Section 360v authorizes the Secretary, after the proclamation of a national marketing quota, to increase or terminate the quota, if he finds on the basis of an investigation that the amount of potatoes free of marketing restrictions will be less than a normal supply of potatoes. If increased he shall specify the amount of increase in existing quotas on a seasonal group basis or on the entire crop as he finds necessary to make the amount of potatoes free of marketing restrictions equal the normal supply. If an increase is proclaimed, acreage allotments (on a seasonal group or for the entire crop) shall be increased by a uniform percentage.

APPLICABILITY OF THE PART

Section 360w provides that the potato marketing quota program shall apply only to the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

APPLICABILITY OF DECLARATION OF POLICY TO POTATOES

Section 2 of the bill substitutes the word "potatoes" for "corn" in the declaration of policy provisions of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce in the agricultural commodities to which the marketing quota provisions of the 1938 act were made applicable. Originally, corn was one of the commodities for which marketing quotas were authorized. The corn provisions of the 1938 act were repealed in 1954, but the reference in section 2 of the act to corn was never specifically repealed. The substitution of "potatoes" for "corn" as provided in section 2 of the bill is a convenient way to make the declaration of policy applicable to potatoes and inapplicable to corn.

DEFINITIONS

Section 3 of the bill amends section 301 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to define for potatoes the terms "market," "marketing year," "normal production," "normal supply," "normal yield" for farm and county, "total supply," "potatoes," "crop year," and the six "seasonal groups" of potatoes. These definitions are similar to the definitions of these terms applicable to other commodities. It should be noted, however, that the definition of "normal supply" includes provision for adjustment of the normal supply to provide a supply calculated to bring prices not in excess of 100 percent of the parity price but as near to such price level as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

REVIEW PROCEEDINGS

Section 4 amends section 361 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to make the review proceedings which are presently applicable to marketing quotas on the commodities now covered by the act applicable to potatoes.

ADJUSTMENT OF QUOTAS

Section 5 of the bill amends section 371(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to include potatoes among the other commodities subject to marketing quotas with respect to which the Secretary is authorized to increase or terminate any marketing quota or acreage allotment on account of a material increase in export demand or national emergency or to effect the declared policy of the act. This authority is in addition to that provided in section 360v which is designed to insure the production of a normal supply of potatoes.

PAYMENT AND COLLECTION OF PENALTIES

Section 6 of the bill amends section 372(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to make the provisions of that section, which deal with the payment and collection of penalties, applicable to potatoes.

REPORTS AND RECORDS; MEASUREMENT OF FARMS; REGULATIONS

Section 7 of the bill amends sections 373, 374, and 375 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to make the provisions of those sections, which deal with reports and records, measurements of farms, and authority to issue regulations, applicable to potatoes.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for a constitutional amendment relative to equal rights for men and women. This bill would simply provide that equality of rights under law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

The State of Wyoming, Mr. President, has a singular interest in this legislation because it is a State that has led the Nation in providing its citizens who are members of the fair sex with rights equal to those enjoyed by men. Even before Wyoming became a State it had provided that women should be franchised and should have the right to sit upon juries. In fact, the State of Wyoming is rightfully known as the Equality State.

One of our great women, Esther Morris, is commemorated by a statue in Statuary Hall in this building.

The history of this Nation has seen a continuing struggle waged by American women who refuse to accept second-class status either by tradition or by law. It is well known that both the English commonlaw and French and Spanish civil law were based on the then prevalent theories that women were of lesser status than men. I believe there are few people living today who still hold that theory, but, nevertheless, it is still reflected in many of our laws. Through their constant efforts to obtain equal rights the women of America have obtained the right to vote and many of the other rights previously denied them. My bill would bring to a conclusion the efforts started by Abigail Adams in 1789 and wipe out from our legal code the last vestiges of the ancient concept of women as a chattel.

This joint resolution has been introduced today for a peculiarly appropriate reason, the anniversary of the birth of the foremost of the women who waged continued battle for their rights—Susan B. Anthony. Her birthday was celebrated on Friday; unfortunately, the Congress was not in session that day, so I am introducing it on the next legislative day, today.

Mr. President, there is a regrettable tendency for many people to consider the battle for equal rights already won. This is not the case and there are many of us who hope that this bill will provide a suitable climax to that battle. I am happy to say that sentiment in favor of this bill has increased tremendously in recent years. When first introduced, this proposed amendment had the support of exactly one Senator. Today we have a long list of sponsors and an

equally long list of supporters outside the Congress. I am pleased to report that when this bill is introduced today it carries with it the names of 35 Members of this body as cosponsors.

Not only have this sizable number of Senators given their support, but the President of this Nation has said:

You have my assurance that I will interpret the Democratic platform, as I know it is intended, to bring about, through concrete action including the adoption of the equal rights for women amendment, the full equality for women which advocates of the equal rights amendment have always sought.

During the last presidential campaign Vice President JOHNSON said:

I have consistently supported the resolution in the Senate for equal rights for men and women and I intend to continue with this support.

Mr. President, in the year 1648 Margaret Brent presented a suffrage petition, the first in this Nation, to the Maryland House of Delegates. She asked for a voice and a vote for the women of this country. Her petition was not granted anywhere in the Nation until the year 1870 in which year the State of Wyoming voted for women's suffrage. And it took 50 more years to extend this right throughout the Nation. In all, 272 years were spent in obtaining what is now regarded as an elemental right for women. Since that time, 40 years have been spent to obtain equal rights under law for women and I sincerely hope that this year will see the conclusion of that effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution lie on the table for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by Mr. MCGEE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], who is a cosponsor of the joint resolution just introduced, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement, prepared by him, relating to the joint resolution.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SIMPSON ON INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENT GRANTING EQUAL RIGHTS TO WOMEN

As a Senator from the first State in the Union to grant women the great constitutional privilege of voting, I take great pleasure in cosponsoring this bill to further broaden the base of equal rights for women.

It is especially appropriate that this constitutional amendment be introduced so close to the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, one of the great early leaders of the long campaign for equal rights for women.

Another Wyoming pioneer, whose name symbolizes equality for women, is the Nation's first justice of the peace, Esther Morris, of South Pass City. Mrs. Morris' dignity and her profound grasp of the intricacies of the law and of the humanities has etched her name forever in the annals of women's struggle for equality.

It was through her tireless efforts that Wyoming—the Equality State—became the first State in the Nation or the world to pass a women suffrage law.

Esther Morris now enjoys the distinction of constituting Wyoming's sole representation in the Capitol's Statuary Hall through the efforts of a commission which I was pleased to head as Governor of Wyoming.

It was the 16th day of September 1870, that Louisa Ann Swain, of Laramie, Wyo., placed her mark on a ballot to become Wyoming's first woman to assume the dual role of homemaker and elector—a role now enjoyed by women throughout the world.

Women across the Nation, acting in the profile of such courageous leaders as Mrs. Swain, Mrs. Anthony, and Mrs. Morris, now play a vital and often decisive role in all phases of American life.

This proposed constitutional amendment will be another step in the long struggle for equality in leadership, employment, and education that has been waged by the American woman.

DESIGNATION OF 8-DAY PERIOD BEGINNING OCTOBER 12 OF EACH YEAR AS "PATRIOTIC EDUCATION WEEK"

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a joint resolution to designate the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as "Patriotic Education Week."

In both the 86th and 87th Congresses, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey's Fifth District, and I have introduced companion resolutions on this subject, and I am glad to say that Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN is again introducing a companion resolution in the House.

This resolution would authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe Patriotic Education Week in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

This observance has already been proclaimed by Governors of a majority of our States and mayors in more than 100 cities. Patriotic Education Week would begin each year on October 12, Columbus Day, and end 7 days later with the anniversary of the British surrender to our Revolutionary forces at Yorktown.

There is no doubt of the importance of a fuller understanding of the great heritage with which this country is endowed. I believe that October 12 through 19 would be a most appropriate period in which to emphasize our rich historical heritage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as "Patriotic Education Week," introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARCH OF DIMES—EDDIE CANTOR

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this year celebrates the 25th anniversary of the March of Dimes, an undertaking which has contributed greatly toward raising funds for research, resulting in the almost total eradication of the dreaded disease of polio.

A great milestone has been achieved in combating infantile paralysis, which is the other name for polio. The American people can feel justly proud of their accomplishments in that field.

Twenty-five years ago President Franklin D. Roosevelt requested the help and assistance of an outstanding entertainer in getting a million people to contribute $1 each for the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis. Of course, this great entertainer, who has always given unselfishly of his time and energy for humanitarian causes, consented. But then the thought came to him that perhaps the entire country would want to participate by sending 10 cents to the White House. President Franklin D. Roosevelt agreed with this thought, and thus started the March of Dimes campaign, the purpose of which was to stamp out polio. This it has achieved with a great measure of success.

The individual to whom I refer is well known to all of us in this body. His name is Eddie Cantor. He is a symbol of the unselfish and untiring efforts contributed by thousands of other men and women throughout the United States who themselves have dedicated time and energy in making the March of Dimes a success each year.

I might point out that at this very moment Mr. Cantor is not in the best of health himself. I know all of us wish him well and a speedy recovery, for he yet has much to give to his fellow man. He is in every sense of the word a great American.

Mr. President, at this time and on this occasion of the 25th anniversary of the March of Dimes I think it appropriate, and I, therefore, introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would authorize the President of the United States to express the high esteem and appreciation of the American people by the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made, not only to his country, but to mankind throughout the world in their efforts to stamp out that dread disease—polio.

In my opinion, it would be a fitting tribute for the Congress to act promptly and favorably on the resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution remain at the desk for a period of 3 days so that Senators who may wish to become cosponsors may do so.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if my name were added as a cosponsor of this joint resolution to express the American peoples'

deep appreciation to Eddie Cantor for his service and devotion to a great cause—the combating of that dread disease, infantile paralysis. His talent and worth were recognized by President Roosevelt 25 years ago when he asked Eddie to assist him in a drive to raise funds. Eddie Cantor's suggestion that all Americans participate by sending a dime to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue gave birth to a nationwide effort which brought about the eradication of this crippling, killing disease. At this time it is fitting and proper to recognize this great American. Because Eddie Cantor has brought to the world of entertainment the dimension of his own deep and abiding love of his fellow man, he is not merely a national figure. He is a national asset, making each of us the richer for the gift of heart and of humor that he has left along the path of his great career.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should be honored and happy to have the able Senator from New York join as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested, by the Senator from Florida.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) authorizing the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, February 16 was the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is an appropriate moment and a reminder for us to pause and consider the meaning of national independence and personal freedom. Our own struggle for independence was a comparatively easy one. Once fought for, once achieved, our sovereignty as a nation was universally recognized, and our country began its swift ascendance to the rank of world power. Our constitution guaranteed to citizens the basic freedoms which many nations are still fighting for and which some nations, Lithuania among them, have attained and then lost again.

Yes, Lithuanian independence day is not an occasion of joyful celebration and boisterous patriotism like our Fourth of July. It is a somber and meditative time, a time to recall the Lithuanian struggles for freedom and the unhappy periods of foreign domination.

Lithuania is an old country; it has been known to history since 1009. Lithuania was a powerful and independent state in the Middle Ages, but it was annexed by Russia during the third partition of Poland in 1795. Under the cruel hand of the czarist agents many of the individual freedoms of the Lithuanian peoples were lost. The Lithuanians struggled courageously but unsuccessfully to throw off the yoke of foreign oppression. Finally, in 1915 Russian domination was ended when the German armies overran Lithuania, but not until the close of World War I when Germany was defeated and Russia was in the throes of a revolution could the Lithuanians regain their longed for freedom. On February 16, 1918, an independent Lithuanian nation was proclaimed.

On February 16, 1918, began two glorious decades of splendid achievement. The new constitution accorded freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. The 1920 peace treaty with the Soviet Union guaranteed the independence of Lithuania. But the Second World War brought with it a new era of national tragedy for the Lithuanian people.

Soviet demands in June 1940 for the immediate formation of a friendly government and Soviet military occupation marked the end of a sovereign democratic Lithuania and the beginning of its tragic enslavement by the Communists. The new flood of Russian tyranny resulted in the deportation of thousands of Lithuanian citizens. Since 1945 Lithuania has become a vast Soviet prison camp. Land which had been individually farmed for centuries has been collectivized. Everything has been nationalized. Political freedom no longer exists. Independence and personal liberties are but a dream of the past and a hope for the future.

The one inalienable right which the Lithuanians still possess is the right to hope for their freedom. On the 45th anniversary of independence we encourage them to cherish and hold on to this right. We express our heartfelt sympathy for their tragedy and our ardent faith that one day they will regain their sovereignty and personal freedoms.

Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a Senate concurrent resolution urging United Nations support for free elections and an end to Soviet domination in the Baltic States and to ask that it be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from New York.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) favoring consideration of the Baltic States' question by the United Nations, submitted by Mr. KEATING, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial Russian oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; but the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" in the Soviet Union; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take all necessary steps to bring the Baltic States' question before the United Nations and urge that the United Nations request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes of extermination of the peoples of the Baltic States.

STUDY OF DENIAL OF SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES OF VARIOUS COUNTRIES BY UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 4 years ago Congress adopted the Captive Nations Week resolution. By its terms, 1 week each year is designated and devoted to giving special attention to the subjugation of 22 nations by the colonialistic policies of Communist Russia.

In the relatively short period of 40 years, the Soviet Union has compiled the most infamous record of imperialism in history. Nine hundred million people have been placed under the yoke of communistic tyranny. Yet we have unmistakable evidence that the yearning for freedom persists in the hearts and minds of these people. The wall of shame crudely constructed around East Berlin is one sign that the Russians have not destroyed the fervent hope of these oppressed peoples that their lives will once again be their own.

This is the abiding hope of the Congress, too. We publicly declared this in the captive nations resolution of 1959. The resolution specifically named the nations under Communist control and it marked the Soviet Union as the imperialist and aggressor. That the people behind the Iron Curtain heard these words and were encouraged by them cannot be doubted.

Even greater was their encouragement from the Presidential proclamation of 1959 and 1960. President Eisenhower participated wholeheartedly in this effort. His statements proclaiming Captive Nations Week were specific and hard hitting. People throughout the world were inspired by his endorsement of the captive nations cause.

The Kremlin's reaction to those proclamations was immediate. It revealed a great fear of the publicity which accompanied the proclamations. Communism cannot afford the truth and seeks to destroy it. Blistering verbal attacks were forthcoming from Premier Khrushchev and his minions but they could not obfuscate the issue nor miss its meaning.

But Soviet reaction was not the same in 1961 and 1962. What was lacking in our effort which produced such mild response from the Kremlin? Simply this: the statements proclaiming Captive Nations Week in 1961 and 1962 failed to mention the Communists. They failed

to specify the nations we considered captive. In 1962 the proclamation was virtually lost amidst the bustle of midsummer White House activity. Thus, the Nation's attention was called more to White House plans for a vacation than to the plight of the captive nations.

The recent rumors of a secret deal between Washington and Budapest to drop the Hungary issue from the U.N. agenda in return for the release of leaders of the 1956 uprising are most disturbing. We can be certain that such an agreement would be a setback to the freedom-loving people of Hungary, too.

Instead of passing the customary resolution requesting Special U.N. Representative Sir Leslie Munro, of New Zealand, to continue his work of calling world attention to the Hungarian situation last fall, the General Assembly, on the motion of the United States, relieved Sir Leslie from his job and turned it over to Secretary General U Thant with instructions to "take any initiative he deems helpful in relation to the Hungarian question."

Sir Leslie, in his final report, protested that it was essential to keep the facts of the Hungarian situation before the world. We can be certain the Communists want nothing better than to divert the world's attention in the hope of at least hiding that sorry spectacle of its history, later—presumably—to bury it.

Today we find a tragic situation in Cuba, the newest of the captive nations. After fighting bravely for freedom, the Cuban people are oppressed more severely than ever in their history. The Bay of Pigs invasion was a fiasco; and the terms of settling the missile crisis last fall leave Castro in control. Though Cuba has fallen victim to Communist control, we must not accept her present status as permanent.

One of the most important psychological weapons in this cold war struggle, Captive Nations Week, has been blunted by the administration's reluctance to use it boldly and effectively. We must remember that brave people behind the Iron Curtain, in southeast Asia, and now in Cuba are looking to the free world for leadership in their unquenchable determination once again to become free and independent nations. They should not have to strain their eyes to see that leadership emanates from this land of ours, the citadel of freedom. The world should have a strong, forceful statement from the President of the United States this year as the time for Captive Nations Week approaches.

Mr. President, the occasion calls for renewed support of Captive Nations Week. We have no less reason now to endorse the captive nations resolution than existed in 1959. In fact, to its numbers we must add the people of Cuba.

It is for us to take the issue before the United Nations. The world needs to be forcefully reminded of the tyranny and oppression fixed upon the captive peoples by Communist Russia. Those who would compromise the issue of liberty and independence for these people for a so-called stabilization of peaceful conditions are sadly deluded. There is no peace without freedom. That body which the Soviet Union has found to be such a convenient sounding board for their propaganda should hear this issue.

Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution which calls upon the President to take the steps necessary to bring before the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the denial of self-determination to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others, with a view toward the removal of all Communist controls, the return of exiles, and the holding of free elections in these countries. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others have been deprived of their national independence by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the tyranny and oppression of the Communist regime have enslaved the peoples of these captive nations and suppressed their individual liberties and freedom; and

Whereas the subjugation and domination of these peoples by an alien power constitutes a denial of their fundamental human rights and is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the captive peoples have never ceased to strive for freedom and the right of self-determination; and

Whereas it is vital to the security of the United States and the free world that the desire for freedom on the part of the peoples of the captive nations be steadfastly preserved; and

Whereas the people and the Government of the United States share the aspirations of the captive peoples to be free and independent: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the denial of self-determination to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others, with a view toward assuring—

(1) that all Communist troops, agents, colonists, and controls are withdrawn from these countries;

(2) that all exiles from these countries are returned from Siberia and released from prisons and slave-labor camps; and

(3) that free elections are held in these countries under United Nations supervision.

USE OF FOREIGN LUMBER IN ANY CONSTRUCTION COVERED BY FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION-INSURED MORTGAGES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on February 14, 1963, I introduced a bill, S. 782, which would prohibit the use of foreign lumber or other wood products in any construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has indicated his desire to cosponsor this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that Senator CHURCH is a cosponsor of this bill, and I further ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor when the bill is again printed.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 6, 1963:

S. 719. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates: Mr. CLARK.

Authority of February 11, 1963:

S. 772. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including immediate nationwide first-step compliance, and for other purposes: Mr. CASE.

S. 773. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin: Mr. CASE.

QUOT HOMINES—TOT SENTENTIA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is not surprising that the debate over the President's tax bill has evidenced a wide difference of opinion, which of course, is nothing new in a legislative body. In the Roman Senate, that fell under the general category of quot homines—tot sententia—so many men, so many opinions.

On the 17th day of last month, I expressed my opinion on the Senate floor that a tax cut without a substantial reduction in domestic spending would be an unsound economic policy, and I also challenged the efficacy of increased consumer spending as an infallible antidote for the current chronic unemployment.

During the past week, interesting viewpoints have been expressed—by an outstanding labor leader, Walter Reuther; by the President's chief economic adviser, Dr. Heller; and by the able editor of the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Reuther supports an immediate $10 billion tax cut, for the benefit of those in the low-income brackets, which he would superimpose on a spending program far above any that has been proposed by the President. Anyone who objects to this program or to the resulting deficit of $20 billion or more has, according to Mr. Reuther, an "18th century McKinley mind." The NAM, on the contrary, feels

that what is needed is an incentive to the formation and effective use of capital, which would not be remedied by reducing taxes on those in the lower income tax brackets. Dr. Heller says that those who oppose continuous spending beyond one's income are suffering from the Puritan ethic. The Wall Street Journal has pointed out in an editorial, which I shall ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, that Dr. Heller's efforts to improve the economic bloodstream by bleeding it through deficit financing follow the medical thinking of the Dark Ages, when leeches were prescribed to cure anemia.

When this administration took office, it took the position that the budget should be balanced over the business cycle; while deficits might be permitted during economic slumps, these should be counterbalanced by surpluses during periods of prosperity. This policy was recommended both because it was desirable from a domestic point of view and also because it was the only policy which would prevent a disastrous run on the dollar as a result of the unfavorable international balance-of-payments situation.

But it seems that the time for a balanced budget is, like prosperity, always just around the corner. As was said in Alice in Wonderland, "Jam yesterday and jam tomorrow, but never jam today." We have had 24 months of economic expansion. Output, employment, income, and savings are at record levels. Unemployment in the fourth quarter of 1962 stood at 5.6 percent of the labor force. Of the total unemployed at that time—3,600,000 persons—713,000 were married women, and 380,000 were teenage boys. All the teenage boys in school and many of the married women were looking for only part-time jobs, and cannot be considered as unemployed in the ordinary sense of the word.

It seems to me that this is the kind of economic situation which provides an opportunity to balance the budget.

I am in favor of reducing taxes. It seems to me entirely clear that Federal, State, and local taxes are entirely too high. Too many business and personal decisions must be made on the basis of tax considerations, instead of being made on the merits. I think this is unfortunate, and I wish we did not have to have such high taxes. But I do not think we can possibly afford to reduce taxes at the cost of an unbalanced budget.

The Employment Act of 1946 imposes on the Government the responsibility to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. In my judgment, we would do more to accomplish these objectives if we were to rely on free, competitive enterprise—if we were to give up most of the costly Government programs which seek to get Government agencies to do things which free, competitive enterprise can do itself more effectively and more cheaply. During this session of Congress I shall try to encourage and assist those who seek to reduce the role played by the Federal Government in the economic system and to strengthen and emphasize the role played by free, competitive enterprise. But I have my doubts as to how far we can go in reducing unnecessary programs and thereby giving an opportunity for a justified tax cut.

It seems to me clear that any tax cut at the present time—whether the one proposed by Mr. Reuther, or the one proposed by Dr. Heller, or any other—will be paid for only by an increased budgetary deficit at a time of record output, employment, income, and savings. I cannot agree with this. In my judgment, we would be wiser to rely on the Puritan ethic, not on medieval doctors prescribing leeches to cure anemia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD editorials from the Wall Street Journal for January 30 and the Washington Evening Star for February 14.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 30, 1963]

LEECHES TO CURE ANEMIA

It was not long ago, as time runs in history, that physicians recommended curing every human ill from gout to pernicious anemia by bleeding the patient. The few who questioned the practice of leeching met the crushing retort that they were challenging the mainstream of informed medical opinion. And so they were.

Today the same retort is often hurled at anyone who questions the current doctrine that chronic Government deficits are good—nay, even miraculous—economic hygiene. Recently Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, used it quite effectively in response to some criticisms of the administration's budget, tax and monetary policies.

"I think what you are challenging," said Dr. Heller to his critic, "is really the mainstream of economics. I don't think you are challenging merely the policy of one administration."

If by the phrase "mainstream" Dr. Heller means the economic views which dominate our times, then Dr. Heller is right. At least the voices heard most loudly, in the academy or in public life, are those of economists who tell us we need never worry about big Government deficits.

Certainly he is right that anyone who questions all this is not challenging merely the policy of the administration now in power.

There have been, of course, other voices, and not all of them eccentric editors or simple-minded people mindful of what Dr. Heller calls the Puritan Ethic or quoting maxims of McGuffey's Reader. Indeed, more and more theoretical economists with inpeccable credentials have lately spoken out against the new economics, so that it is no longer wholly disreputable to do so. There are even signs that the mainstream of economic thinking is already changing.

But be the alinement of opinion as it may, it is all beside the point. Policy, which is thought put into political action, may be determined by the number of people who endorse it; a division by the numbers has nothing to do with the truth or falsity of an idea.

What the public has now somehow to determine for itself is the truth or falsity of an idea. This idea, as wrapped up by Dr. Heller and put forward by the President, is that the way to cure a professed anemia of the economy is to prescribe for it the biggest peacetime Government deficit ever deliberately planned by any administration.

This idea is presented with much plausible reasoning. A modern economy is more active when there is more spending within it than when there is less. Therefore, so the reasoning goes, the right prescription is for the Government to spend more money. Since there would be little gain if the Government took away from the people the same money it is going to spend, the Government must pump into the economy money that was not there before.

In practice this means that the Government must run a deficit, and a big one, and finance that deficit by having the banking system create more dollars out of the Government's paper. That is why the President proposes both a tax cut and bigger spending in the same breath.

This is a heart-appealing doctrine. How wonderful it would be if all that was required for prosperity and growth was for the Government just to increase our money supply and spend it. For then the thing would be simplicity itself. Then we could have still more tax cuts and still more spending to make still bigger deficits and we'd have the world by the tail.

But is it true?

Is it true that chronic deficits are harmless? Or that the cure for years of deficits is the greatest peacetime deficit ever planned? Does a nation burdened with an imbalance of international payments, a steady loss of its gold reserve, a heavy burden of defense costs, a public debt larger than the world has ever seen—does it solve all these problems by printing more money to spend abroad as well as at home, making its public debt even larger and giving our creditors more reason to trust the value of our gold than the value of our dollars?

Is it true that the United States has somehow found the magic way to avoid forever the day of retribution which has come at last to every nation before us that has followed such a policy?

Now perhaps all of these things are true, as Dr. Heller and many others tell us. But the point of the public discussion is the question of their truth or falsity, not how many men preach them. Bad medicine remains bad medicine though leeches be prescribed by every doctor in the land.

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1963]

THE BASIC PURITAN ETHIC

Chairman Walter Heller, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is both surprised and disturbed over what he calls the basic Puritan ethic of the American people as reflected in their wariness about supporting a tax cut for themselves. He told the House-Senate Economic Committee that there would have to be a greater public education in economics to make clear to these cautious folk the wisdom of a tax cut while the Federal budget is deep in red ink. Mr. Heller is not frightened, of course, by budget deficits and he is confident that the administration's plans to cut taxes—for some of the people, if not all of the people—will lead to higher consumer spending, faster economic growth and more employment.

Without disputing this latter thesis at the moment, we still have a feeling of some respect for a basic Puritan ethic that prompts some Americans to believe that there is virtue in living within one's income. It is a comfortable state of affairs when it can be achieved, and we just hope that the day (or the fiscal year) will come when the Federal Government can accomplish the same.

CRITICISM OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, notwithstanding the order that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes, I ask unanimous consent that at this time, in the morning hour, I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, over the weekend my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] issued a statement in which he took exception to remarks made by myself, by Governor Rockefeller of New York, and by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. The Senator from Arkansas coupled some intemperate observations about "divisive partisanship" and "irresponsibility" with a curious plea for nonpartisanship in the conduct of American foreign policy.

The statement by the Senator from Arkansas was in the form of a press release issued to the Sunday newspapers. It had all the earmarks of an action hastily ordered by the White House, in line with the current campaign to shut up all critics of the New Frontier's shortsighted and disruptive foreign policy, and, in particular, to silence all Republican opposition. It is interesting to me that the erudite chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should want to argue this point in the press rather than on the Senate floor. With his long-held interest in the gentle art of diplomacy, it must have occurred to the Foreign Relations Committee chairman that selective charges of the kind he aired in the Sunday newspapers are the last way to effect any degree of nonpartisanship in the area of foreign relations. This merely bears out what Republicans have been contending all along: that the Kennedy administration wants no part of a bipartisan approach to foreign policy—except when the administration gets into trouble.

Mr. President, Republicans are never consulted on New Frontier foreign-policy decisions before they are made; and I see no indication that the New Frontier's leaders in the Congress are doing anything to further nonpartisanship. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who all of a sudden has remembered the bipartisan tradition of Senator Vandenberg, has not seen fit to bring about a better balance between Republican members and Democratic members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and I am sure the staffing of the committee does not reflect any excessive spirit of bipartisanship.

It is only when something goes wrong that the Democrats remember what they call the Vandenberg tradition. Then they would like everyone to close ranks and outface the world with the solid assertion that "the Kennedy administration can do no wrong, because the Kennedy administration represents America." At such times, according to the Fulbright argument, the so-called loyal opposition is expected to withhold criticism, in the name of nonpartisanship; or, if we are to listen to Senator FULBRIGHT's partner in this administration attempt—Undersecretary of State George W. Ball—we are supposed to shut up completely.

But this applies only when the Democrats are running the Nation's foreign policy. Certainly there was no moratorium on criticism from the Democrats during the Eisenhower administration. As the distinguished columnist for the Washington Star, Mr. Gould Lincoln, wrote only last Saturday:

> What was the attitude of President Kennedy and Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., of the Democratic Advisory Council (was included many of the most prominent figures in the Democratic Party) regarding the Eisenhower administration and its dealings with friend or foe? What did they have to say about failures of the United States? They heaped criticism for years on the Republican President for, as they said, loss of friends and loss of U.S. prestige abroad. Where was the rush to the defense of the country? Or did these spokesmen lay the blame on President Eisenhower and his Secretaries of State John Foster Dulles and Christian Herter?

Mr. President, it comes with ill grace for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to argue for the Vandenberg tradition to those of us who remember President Kennedy's election campaign, who remember the U–2 incident and the planned breakup of the Paris summit conference, who remember Stevenson's castigation of the U.S. Government for what he termed "a series of blunders."

Mr. President, I am sure Senators remember that when Republicans were calling attention to the original Soviet missile buildup in Cuba—that is, before President Kennedy finally acknowledged the emergency—at that time, everyone who criticized the indecision and timidity of the Kennedy administration was automatically labeled "a Republican extremist." Now today everyone who criticizes the Kennedy administration is merely Republican. The base is broadening, but apparently it is too much to expect administration spokesmen to include among the so-called irresponsible members of the President's own political party or that great segment of the American people who share the Republican belief that we are on the wrong track.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] appears greatly upset over Republican attacks on the administration's foreign policy. But I can hardly believe that he is so poorly informed on foreign policy matters that he has not heard how the Democratic Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] feels about our policy in the Congo, or how the Democrats, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] feel about Cuba. I cannot believe that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has overlooked the fact that criticism of the administration's handling of the Cuban problem and other foreign relations matters is completely bipartisan—primarily because that criticism stems directly from the feelings of the American people. By singling out Republicans in his ill-advised press release on Sunday, the Foreign Relations chairman did more to try and make this whole thing a strictly partisan question than any Republican critic of administration policies.

In this morning's paper, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is quoted as stating that Republican badgering could push the Government into taking unwise action in Cuba. This is an amazing statement. Not only does it suggest that every bit of criticism over the administration's policy in Cuba is Republican, but it holds out the prospect of the New Frontier's taking unwise action for political reasons. I say that if the Kennedy administration can be badgered into taking unwise action, that is, action that runs counter to the best interests of the American people, for any reason at all, then it has no business holding office. I am amazed that the Senator from Arkansas has so little faith in the administration of which he is a part.

And at the very moment when the Senator from Arkansas was worrying about Republican badgering over Cuba, a prominent Democrat—the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, was on a nationwide television demanding that the administration make the elimination of Soviet troops from Cuba its No. 1 foreign policy project.

I believe it is reasonable to ask, in this connection, why the administration never takes any kind of stand with regard to Communist Cuba until the Republicans begin translating the will of the American people. It can be recalled that long before the President acted last October, Republicans repeatedly had called for a blockade to halt the Soviet arms buildup in the Western Hemisphere. I suggest that if the administration had listened to Republican advice immediately following the Bay of Pigs fiasco, there never would have been a missile crisis, an East-West confrontation and the danger of nuclear war. If Cuba had been blockaded in 1961, we would not today be worried about the presence of 17,000 Russian troops, 102 Mig fighters, armored divisions, and all the rest—because they would not be there.

But the problem is with us now—and it is going to remain with us until the Kennedy administration dredges up enough gumption to do something to end it once and for all. It will not be easy—not nearly as easy as it would have been 2 years ago, or even last October, for that matter. But I believe a new and different kind of blockade—a blockade of all shipments of any kind to Castro's Cuba—would be the way to start. And I say this fully realizing that the timid souls along the New Frontier will raise their arms in horror and insist that GOLDWATER wants to get us into war.

Mr. President, let me say that Republicans collect a lot of abuse from the administration and its apologists because of their consistent stand against a Soviet bastion in the Western Hemisphere. But this is a small price to pay for the privilege of representing the heartfelt wishes of the American people in a way that may prod the national administration into a realization of our danger.

But this hardly qualifies us for charges such as those contained in Senator FULBRIGHT's statement.

Let me quote one of these passages verbatim:

> It would be a tragedy of incalculable proportions if, despite the failures of their own efforts, the Communists were to realize their

aims as a result of the excesses and shortsightedness of partisan politics in our own country.

Now, Mr. President, this is a mealymouthed way of saying that Republicans who criticize policies of the Kennedy administration are more dangerous to the country than the dangers of communism itself. This is not only completely ridiculous, but it is a tactic which I suggest is unworthy of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is a tactic which has, in the past, been severly condemned on the floor of the Senate and which should be condemned again. Any suggestion that Republicans who sincerely and deeply oppose certain foreign policy approaches of the administration are siding, wittingly or unwittingly, with the enemy is as disgraceful as it is irresponsible. Republican opponents of the New Frontier's foreign policies have only one thing in mind—the good of the American people and the safety of the Nation. And no collection of strictly partisan charges leveled by the Foreign Relations chairman to silence criticism of the administration will change the situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona and his attack on the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee during the past weekend.

I am sorry the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is not present at the moment. But I would call to the attention of my friend, the Senator from Arizona, that one of the things which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wanted to do was to keep the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations this year at exactly the same membership ratio that obtained last year. In other words, the Senator was interested in keeping the committee bipartisan. He was interested in seeing to it that Republicans, despite the difference in ratio, were given the same proportion of representation this year that they had last year. I bring that point to the attention of the Senator from Arizona because he indicated at the beginning of his remarks that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas, did not believe in bipartisanship, that he had sounded the death knell to the Vandenberg tradition, and had in some way sought to bring about a change in the ratio of the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In the opinion of the Senator from Montana—and I am sure also in the opinion of the Senator from Arkansas—the matter of criticism is an important one. Criticism should not be withheld, but criticism should not be made merely for the sake of criticism. It should be made with the idea in mind that it would be constructive and that alternatives would be offered. I noted that the Senator from Arizona indicated he believes there is an alternative. He has advocated a total blockade of Cuba at this time.

As far as criticism by Republicans is concerned, I wish to say that they are not supposed to remain silent. They are not supposed to shut up. But they are supposed, I would assume, to speak when they have definite information, to talk in a vein toward making our country more solid and more secure, and to do so in a manner which would not in any way bring about a divisiveness in the Nation.

I am glad that the Senator from Arizona stated that the Republicans believe in what is good for the American people and what is in the best interest of the security of our Nation.

The Senator made reference to criticism of the Eisenhower administration by Democrats. I believe I can say without contradiction that, as far as criticism on the floor of the Senate during the two Eisenhower administrations was concerned, it was conducted at a high level. To my knowledge, there was no criticism, except perhaps in minor instances, for the sake of criticism. When criticism was offered, it was made in an attempt to be constructive and to offer possible alternatives.

The Senator from Arizona mentioned the fact that the Democratic Advisory Council on occasion issued statements criticizing the Eisenhower administration quite severely. I point out that at that time the Democratic Advisory Council had no connection whatsoever with either the House of Representatives or the Senate, and what the members of that council did, they did on their own responsibility, just as what we did in the Senate we did on our own responsibility.

The Senator from Arizona also referred to the fact that Democrats stated during the Eisenhower administration that during that administration there was a great loss of friends and a great loss of prestige. But I would point out to him that some days ago Republicans likewise issued a number of statements which I think could be considered in somewhat the same category.

For example, if I recall correctly, the present administration was accused of being responsible for a sweeping wave of anti-Americanism in England, in France, and in Canada. I disagree with that statement. While there is a certain amount of anti-Americanism in all those countries, I think that it is not something new.

A question was also brought up about the Democratic position on the Indian acquisition of Goa and the loss of west Irian or west New Guinea to Indonesia. I heard no criticism on the floor of the Senate at that time.

I would say that what we have seen here this morning is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. I would call to the attention of the Senator from Arizona the fact that the Republican leadership of both Houses, to my knowledge, has been called to the White House, in the little more than 2 years of this administration, in excess of 40 times, to be briefed on what were the foreign policy difficulties at the moment. They were asked for their advice and counsel, and at times it was forthcoming and at other times it was not.

But this is not a case of the Republicans—using the words of the former minority leader and majority leader, former Senator Knowland—being in on the crash landing and not being in on the takeoff. They have been very well informed by this administration.

I, for one, have no apologies whatsoever to offer for what the administration has done in its little more than 2 years in office. I make these statements because I think the Senator from Arizona should be answered. I hope these statements will be given the consideration which I think both statements deserve.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy to hear the majority leader acknowledge that the opposition not only has a right but also a duty to perform in calling the attention of the public to the mistakes which they feel are made by the party in power.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield at that point——

Mr. GOLDWATER. I can assure the Senator that we intend to continue this.

The Senator made some reference to the fact that we should make these criticisms only when we have some alternatives to offer. I might suggest to the distinguished majority leader that during last summer and early last fall, through September, we were asking for a blockade of Cuba. Finally the President of the United States saw fit to follow our suggestions. I think he was very wise. We backed him to a man. I do not think any President in the history of this country has ever enjoyed a more thorough or stronger backing than the President received from Democrats and Republicans alike in that particular period.

I call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the fact that in the last week, after constant prodding by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and others, including members of his own party, the administration did what should have been done a long time ago—it told the truth about Cuba, as to the number of Soviet troops.

So I think that the loyal opposition, if we are to call ourselves that, has been extremely loyal. I think we have followed the line of decency in our comments. I think we have not "gone off halfcocked." I think we have reported the truth.

I am very happy that the administration last week was finally put in the position of having to tell the American people about the number of Soviet troops in Cuba, and the equipment they have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield there?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not care to comment further on the Senator's answer. I am glad he gave me the opportunity to defend further the Republican Party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Arizona the fact that when I referred to criticism by the opposition I was not talking about criticism for criticism's sake, but criticism of a constructive nature which would help the administration, exactly as criticism by Democrats during the Eisenhower administration was made by and large with the purpose in mind of helping that administration.

After all, this is only one problem of many which confront the President, who is supposed to look after the foreign policy interests of this country—and who does. He has to consider not only Cuba, Latin-America, Africa, and Western Europe, but also the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Taiwan, Korea, and other places as well. His responsibilities are both onerous and tremendous.

The comment about the backing given by the Republicans and by all Americans in reference to the situation last October is true. There was a wholehearted backing on the part of the American people of the stand taken by the President at that time. But before the President took that stand he had been absolutely assured and reassured by the intelligence chiefs in the Nation's Capital that the initial information brought to his attention was correct. Once he was satisfied in his mind that the photographs indicated what he was told they meant—when he was sure of it—then he called in the leadership, told them what his policy would be, and got their unanimous support.

The Senator from Arizona has indicated that he is glad that the administration made the television appearance to the people a week or so ago. Frankly, I am a little sorry that it was forced, in a manner of speaking, to show all this detail which has to do with intelligence, because I do not think that it is good for the country, nor do I think it is bad for our enemies, because they could tell from the photographs which were shown to the American people exactly what the situation is, and it is possible they did not have all this information before.

I think one can go too far in dispersing confidential intelligence information, and I think information of that type has to be guarded in a secret manner—as a matter of fact, in a supersecret manner.

I did not see the McNamara TV show, but I would assume that much of that which was shown at that time was shown to both the Democratic and Republican leadership at the meetings held at the White House at the instance of the President of the United States.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might make one other observation; that this whole matter of Cuba was not brought up by the Republicans. I suggest that the matter of Cuba—the Bay of Pigs, et cetera—was pretty much a closed book in this country until the Attorney General took it on himself, for his own reasons, which we do not know, to try to change history. The Republicans could not let that ride. So I put the blame for this whole thing on the Attorney General, for ever having opened up that which was to all of us a closed book.

I wish to remind the distinguished majority leader that the President of the United States is my President as well as his. I wish for him nothing but the best, because when he has the best we shall have the best operation of the country. The country belongs to the Republicans as well as to the Democrats. We are as anxious as the Democrats to see this country happily going down the road to prosperity and peace.

I am glad today to see the majority leader recognize that it is not only a duty but also an obligation of the Republican Party to stand in opposition when we feel it is right, exactly as the distinguished majority leader felt that it was the duty of his party to stand in opposition when his party was the minority party.

I believe that this kind of two-party system in our country, operating throughout the country and through our National Legislature, can bring information to the people that they should have.

I might say that I agree in some essence with the comment made by the Senator from Montana about not making some of this type of material available, but I must suggest that this information has been pouring into this country from foreign countries and from sources other than our CIA. The revelations of the CIA and Secretary McNamara were no secret. We did not learn anything from them.

But I am very glad that the air has been cleared. I can assure the Senator from Montana that, so far as the junior Senator from Arizona is concerned—and I am sure I speak for other Republicans—we do not intend to indulge in baseless charges or in the use of rumor. If we did, we could be at it 24 hours a day, for the rumors and information are that plentiful.

In closing, let me again thank the majority leader for recognizing the role of the Republican Party in this whole scheme of things.

LONGSHOREMEN'S SELFLESS BATTLE AGAINST RED SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an American trade union's opposition to trade by Communist countries with Cuba has developed in an extremely interesting way. The fact is that in 1962, 92 Yugoslav ships and 55 Polish ships called at U.S. ports. In protest against the heavy traffic to Cuba by Yugoslav and Polish ships, the International Longshoremen's Association has refused to load the ships of these countries. This has been a selfless act because it cost the jobs of ILA union members. Seventy-five ships have not been loaded. It means union members have suffered for having taken this action in pursuit of American foreign policy goals as the ILA sees them.

This morning's Wall Street Journal has an excellent article discussing the union ban on Yugoslav and Polish ships.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed. It is particularly pertinent because the Wall Street Journal indicates that White House pressure has persuaded the dock union to lift the ban for the coming week. It will be interesting to hear from the State Department why the pressure was put on the ILA to ease off on this Communist trade with Cuba.

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

DOCK UNION'S BAN ON YUGOSLAV, POLISH SHIPS IS DELAYED—WHITE HOUSE PRESSURE IS CITED

(By Richard R. Leger)

NEW YORK.—Citing pressure from the White House, the head of the International Longshoremen's Association temporarily halted the union's plans to put into effect this week a sweeping boycott of all Yugoslavian and Polish ships.

Capt. William V. Bradley, president of the ILA, said he agreed, after receiving a phone call from George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, to postpone the boycott until ILA leaders discuss the boycott with Mr. Meany and the State Department in Washington. The meeting will possibly be held tomorrow.

Captain Bradley said Mr. Meany told him the White House was disturbed at the action the ILA had planned.

The boycott by the ILA, planned because the dock workers' union learned Yugoslavian and Polish ships had been calling at Cuban ports, would mean that 150 Yugoslavian and 139 Polish vessels would be unable to load or discharge cargo at U.S. ports from Searsport, Maine, to Brownsville, Tex.

The two Communist countries were fairly active in calling at U.S. ports last year. Yugoslavian vessels called 92 times and Polish ships stopped 55 times at the Port of New York in 1962.

Captain Bradley said the ILA had received a phone call from the State Department last Thursday. "They said it would be as bad as our strike because so many ships would be involved," Captain Bradley said.

The 100,000-member union paralyzed Atlantic and gulf ports with a strike from December 23 to January 26. The strike ended when both sides accepted a settlement proposal by Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon.

At least one ILA official was still optimistic the boycott would still be put into effect. John Condon, legislative director of the ILA and organizer of the ILA's boycott program, said, "Our executive board would have trouble answering to the rank and file if they stopped the boycott now."

SQUEEZING CUBA HARDER

The union started its boycott program October 8, shortly before President Kennedy ordered a naval blockade of Cuba following the discovery of Russian missile bases there. But while the Government long since has called off the blockade, the ILA is squeezing Cuba harder than ever.

The ILA's first step was to try to bar from the gulf and Atlantic ports, where its members work, all ships of any shipping line participating in Cuban traffic. This was effective in reducing travel to Cuba by free world ships, but vessels from Communist countries kept up shipments. The ILA was hindered in using its boycott against Red ships because it often didn't know which of the state-owned shipping lines were calling on Cuba.

But last week the union announced it would boycott all vessels of any Communist country known to be sendings ships to Cuba. The first results of this policy were to be the bans against Yugoslavia and Poland. The Yugoslav Embassy in Washington al-

ready has told the ILA that the movements of Yugoslav ships are controlled by "various Yugoslav enterprises," not the Government. But the ILA insists that President Tito's government really owns the ships.

The ILA's boycott is far tougher than the new policy on Cuban traffic announced by Mr. Kennedy earlier this month. The President merely barred the shipment of U.S. Government-financed goods aboard any foreign vessel that had been to Cuba since January 1, unless the shipowners involved promise not to send their vessels to Cuba again.

Aside from publicity, the ILA doesn't stand to gain from the boycott. It cuts work for longshoremen. Mr. Condon says the boycott has directly stopped 75 ships from being loaded or unloaded so far. But despite its apparent lack of self-interest, the ILA has come under heavy criticism for the boycotts.

"I think it's a grave situation when an American union takes the country's foreign policy into its own hands," says one shipping industry official. "There's no telling where this may stop."

PROBLEMS FOR SHIPOWNERS

The State Department, which until this weekend had been silent on the ILA boycotts, now has called them "not helpful." But the union has interpreted the Government's long silence as approval of its action: "We feel that their not telling us to stop this is, in effect, cooperation," comments Mr. Condon. "But if the Government asked us to stop what we're doing, I doubt that we would. And in America there's no way that they could make us stop."

The ILA boycott causes serious problems for shipowners, many of whom are foreigners, and the brokers who arrange cargoes for vessels. "All commercial charterers or shippers now require guarantees in all contracts to preclude ships not being loaded by the ILA once they charter it," explains Mack Klosty, president of the Association of Ship Brokers and Agents.

The protective clause demanded by a leading grain exporter requires the shipowner to guarantee that neither the vessel being hired, nor any other vessel of "the same ownership, operation or control," has "entered any Cuban on Communist-bloc port or place after September 1, 1962," or "will enter any such port or place prior to completion of loading under this charter party."

"A considerable number of opportunities to complete a charter have been missed because of the past history of some vessels," says Mr. Klosty. A simple check with the ILA to see if a ship is on its blacklist isn't enough, since the list is always changing. Thus, brokers such as Mr. Klosty must run their own investigations and ask assurances from owners that their ships haven't touched Cuban ports.

At one time last fall the ILA's blacklist contained the names of some 300 ships. The list dwindled to 30 as one shipowner firm after another promised the union its ships would steer clear of Cuba and was rewarded by having its vessels stricken from the blacklist.

But the number of banned ships will shoot up again soon. The union is preparing a new blacklist based on a list of free world shipping to Cuba recently released by the U.S. Maritime Administration. The new blacklist will add the ships of some 25 firms—including Swedish, Italian, Dutch, British, and West German shipping concerns—to the group subject to ILA boycotts.

The ILA is now pressing the Government for a list of all ships going to Cuba, so it can enforce its new blanket ban on shipping of Communist nations which send vessels to the island. "Once the lists are released we could do a more thorough job stopping the loading of ships that called on Cuba and have a 100-percent boycott," says Mr. Condon.

STATE'S 7 FATEFUL DAYS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "The Department and the Cuban Crisis," written by Frank A. Sieverts, who was my legislative assistant until recently, but who is now special assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs in the State Department. He writes an article telling what happened in the crucial 7 days from the time the State Department discovered for certain that there were offensive Russian missiles in Cuba until the President's speech. It is an excellent article written by an extraordinarily able young man. The article appeared in the December 1962 issue of the Department of State News Letter.

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

THE DEPARTMENT AND THE CUBAN CRISIS

(By Frank A. Sieverts, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs)

The initial moves of the Cuban crisis—and the means chosen by the United States to respond—are in the public record. Less well known is the part played by the Department of State in the early phase of the drama.

It is a story of preparations for major diplomatic initiatives closely coordinated with military efforts on the high seas, of worldwide communications conducted at high speed under drumtight security.

The preparations involved several branches of the Government, each of which became a focal point for part of what happened. To some extent each viewed the course of events from the perspective of its responsibilities. Each has an important story to tell.

Little is known about what went on during the week leading up to the President's televised speech because, as the President stated at his November 20 press conference, "Until we made the announcement on the quarantine on Monday afternoon (October 22)—this matter was kept in the highest levels of Government."

At first only half a dozen people in the State Department, and equivalent numbers in other branches of the Government, knew the full details of the Cuban situation. The reasons for the security precautions were stated by the President on the same occasion: "It would have been a great mistake, and possibly a disaster, if this news had dribbled out when we were unsure of the extent of the Soviet buildup in Cuba and when we were unsure of our response and when we had not consulted with any of our allies."

Much of the chronicle can now be told, and to do so may provide useful knowledge about the interior functioning of the State Department in a period of high stress.

The story begins Monday evening October 15—7 days almost to the hour before the President addressed the Nation. The "readout" on aerial reconnaissance photographs taken the previous day revealed that medium-range ballistic missiles of the mobile type paraded at May Day celebrations in Moscow were in place in Cuba.

During the evening the information was relayed to principal officers of the White House, the Department of Defense, and the Department of State. Secretary Rusk took the call during a formal dinner for German Foreign Minister Schroeder. Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs Edwin M. Martin was reached at the National Press Club, just as he finished an address on the Cuban situation to the Washington, D.C., Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi—the journalism fraternity. A number of key persons got the message during an informal party at the Fort McNair residence of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

At 9 a.m. Tuesday morning October 16, the President was briefed on the intelligence gleaned from the photographs. He convened a meeting at the White House, the first of many with the interdepartmental policy group set up to deal with the crisis that the pictures implied, and decided to sharply increase reconnaissance of Cuba.

The meeting was attended by the Vice President, the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Treasury, the Attorney General, and top officials from the State and Defense Departments and the intelligence community. The main participants from the State Department in the policy deliberations that day and on subsequent days, besides the Secretary, were: Under Secretary George W. Ball, Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs U. Alexis Johnson, Assistant Secretary Martin, Ambassador at Large Llewellyn E. Thompson, and U.N. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson.

The next 3 days were a "blur of meetings," according to one participant, partly at the White House and partly, when the President did not attend himself, at the State Department in Under Secretary Ball's conference room. It was a period of full and free discussion that Secretary Rusk has since described as "boxing the compass of possibilities."

To limit the possible spread of information during this period senior officers did their own typing; some of the Secretary's basic papers were done in his own handwriting. Under Secretary Ball and Deputy Under Secretary Johnson took turns staying at the Department through the night so that a senior officer who was taking part in the policy deliberations would be on duty at all times.

At 5 p.m. Thursday the President met with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko at the White House, with Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Thompson present. A dinner was given that evening for Mr. Gromyko at the State Department. While the dinner was in progress, the policy group of principals continued to meet in Under Secretary Ball's conference room. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his Deputy, Roswell Gilpatric, seen arriving at the Department, were assumed by reporters to be en route to the dinner. At 10 p.m. the President called the group into conference with him. To avoid attracting attention to their cars, nine of them rode to the White House in one automobile. At this meeting the final consensus began to develop.

Thursday and Friday key aids were brought in to advise on the legal implications of a quarantine and other subjects. As the outlines of the probable course of policy became clear, working groups were established within the planning group. Friday afternoon our ambassadors to Latin American countries who were in the United States were ordered back to their posts. Late that night the first draft of the President's speech was written.

The 4 days of discussion, planning, and preparations came to focus Saturday afternoon, when the President convened his policy group in the Oval Room at the White House. A detailed intelligence briefing was given and aerial photographs were exhibited. The President decided to institute a defensive quarantine to halt introduction of offensive weapons into Cuba as quickly as possible, but taking into account the need to notify our allies, to make the necessary military preparations, and to secure the legal authority stemming from a resolution of the Organization of American States. The President's television address was set tentatively for 7 p.m. Monday, designated "P" hour. There

remained the possibility of acting sooner if security was breached. The final decision was to be made by the President at 10 a.m. Sunday.

That evening began 48 hours of round-the-clock work at the State Department. Senior officers took direct charge of operations temporarily, making less use than is normal of subordinate officers. A detailed scenario was drawn up by Deputy Under Secretary Johnson, scripting the anticipated sequence of events hour by hour. Instructions to Latin American posts were written by Assistant Secretary Martin and transmitted late Saturday night, subject to a "go" signal Sunday or Monday

In a city brimming with curiosity Sunday, the executive secretariat staff and key Bureau personnel were summoned to the Department, fashioning explanations or excuses as best they could under the rigid security conditions. Messages explaining the proposed course of action had to be prepared for transmission to all posts. The quarantine proclamation and the proposed Security Council and OAS resolutions had to be drafted. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson who had participated in the policy discussions earlier in the week, was briefed for his mission to France and NATO. Close liaison was established between the Operations Center in the State Department, the War Room at the Pentagon, and the Situation Room at the White House. Steps were taken to secure and speed message traffic relating to the crisis.

Sunday night detailed instructions were cabled to all Ambassadors. The text of the President's speech with a covering letter to Premier Khrushchev was sent to our Moscow Embassy for delivery to the Soviet Foreign Office 1 hour before the President was to speak.

The President's letters to Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, Chancellor Adenauer, Prime Minister Nehru, Prime Minister Diefenbaker, Prime Minister Fanfani, Berlin Mayor Brandt, and others were transmitted. In total Presidential letters were sent to 43 heads of government.

During the weekend the State Department transmitted messages, letters, and documents to 441 recipients. All messages had to be sent in code, nearly all top secret, straining the Department's communications facilities to the limit.

The cable traffic was so heavy that there was some uncertainty as to whether all messages had gotten through to the designated recipients. To verify that the telegrams had been received, telephone calls were made to some posts on Monday to check that scheduled actions and precautions would be taken.

On Monday, October 22, the President formally established the Executive Committee of the National Security Council and asked it to meet with him daily at 10 a.m.

When the "go" signal was transmitted our Ambassadors notified the Government to which each was accredited that they would have a message to convey 1 hour before "P" hour.

At noon, the White House requested air time from the radio and television networks and announced that the President would make an important statement at 7 p.m. Nine radio stations agreed to broadcast the speech in Spanish to Latin America. During the day revisions in the speech text were transmitted, as were proposed changes in messages to heads of government. Preparations continued for our initiatives in the Security Council and the OAS.

The Cabinet met at 4 p.m., and at 5 p.m. congressional leaders were briefed at the White House. At 6 p.m. Secretary Rusk called in Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin. At 6:15 p.m. Under Secretary Ball and Director of Intelligence and Research Roger Hilsman briefed 46 allied Ambassadors in the State Department International Conference room.

Briefings were also held for Ambassadors of nonalined nations and the press, and Assistant Secretary Martin had a separate meeting with OAS Ambassadors. Aerial photographs showing the missiles and other offensive weapons in Cuba were shown at each briefing.

At 7 p.m. the crisis became visible as the President began to speak.

SENATOR NELSON'S GREAT CONSERVATION RECORD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the former Governor of Wisconsin, now my junior colleague, GAYLORD NELSON, is one of the outstanding former Governors of the country. He has a truly great record on conservation, a record which has not been given adequate national consideration.

The Wisconsin AFL–CIO Convention carried an extraordinary article about GAYLORD NELSON and his conservation record in its recent report. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONSERVATION COMMITTEE PRELIMINARY REPORT, WISCONSIN AFL–CIO CONVENTION, 1962

For too long the working people of Wisconsin have allowed the conservation of our natural resources to be the sole concern of fishing and hunting clubs, often dominated by wealthy employers.

Yet many of our members are dedicated conservationists who delight in the pleasures of camping, boating, fishing, hunting, hiking, and other outdoor recreational pursuits.

Today everyone with a 2-week vacation knows that outdoor life in Wisconsin is at the crossroads. The stork with its bountiful crop of babies each year and the union contract with its 2- and 3-week paid vacations, have each in their own way added to the problem.

GOV. GAYLORD NELSON has provided enlightened and vigorous leadership in conservation.

"Each of us," Governor NELSON told the legislature last year, "can recall a favorite picnic spot that is now a housing development, a wonderful duck marsh that has been drained for farming, a scenic highway stretch that is now cluttered with billboards and roadside stands, a once-secret trout stream that is no more, or a peaceful lake that has been encircled and closed off by private landowners, or overrun and heavily pressured by powerboats."

The Wisconsin labor movement has a long and distinguished record in public service. Our support for conservation flows from this long and good tradition.

Our members have jobs which depend on the sale of outboard motors and camping equipment. Our members build the resorts. Our members serve the tourists in motels, hotels and restaurants. Countless thousands of our people directly depend on the outdoor recreational business which accounts for millions of dollars in yearly income for the State today.

But our strongest argument for conservation comes from our duty as citizens who seek the good life for ourselves and our children. We rebel at asphalt jungles far from the wilds of the little frontier regions still left in Wisconsin.

Labor's fight for public education is well-documented. We still fight for schools because our children need the opportunity to grow mentally and develop their talents to the fullest. Likewise, we fight for parks, beaches, lakes, and streams because our families seek that bit of nature which makes us whole people.

Governor NELSON'S 10-year $50 million program to acquire more parks, save more beauty spots along our highways, create more lakes, save our streams and forests for fish and wildlife—is a program Wisconsin labor heartily endorses. Wisconsin's conservation program is a landmark for other states—but even the Wisconsin program is but a start to provide outdoor recreation for the estimated 6 million population (a gain of 54 percent from today) we will have in 1980. In addition, the Chicago area will grow to over 12 million in 25 years, adding to the pressure on Wisconsin parks and outdoor areas.

We need Federal money to double what Wisconsin is doing today. With more cars, more money, more time, and more people the public outcry for a place to wet a trout line, fire at a duck, swim in a lake, pitch a tent, or just relax and enjoy the autumn leaves will reach the point of no return.

Wisconsin under Governor NELSON'S leadership has done better than any other State. but even with a good State program there is much more which needs doing to save the beauties and unspoiled areas of Wisconsin for ourselves and future generations.

A good illustration of State-Federal cooperation is seen in the fight for an Ice Age National Scientific Reserve, better known as the Kettle Moraine Park, promoted by Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Milwaukee. In his conservation message to Congress this year, President Kennedy called for approval of 32,000 more acres in the Ice Age Park, paid for by Federal and State matching funds. Such a park or scientific reserve would provide recreational facilities within easy driving distance for 5 million people, plus millions more in future years.

Long ago, Wisconsin labor understood that spending money for schools and parks is the best investment we can make as citizens.

We challenge the critics of spending for schools and parks.

America, the beautiful, is in danger. The land of forests with deer, and lakes with muskies, parks for family picnics and hiking trails—this part of America may die or radically decay during the next 10 years unless we spend money and spend it now: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO convention go on record in support of:

1. Federal-State financing to expand the acquisition of parks and the development of other conservation programs contained in the Nelson $50 million, 10-year program.

2. Youth Opportunities Act, now pending in Congress, to provide youth conservation camps for constructive outdoor work for millions of unemployed young men.

3. Ice Age Scientific Reserve developed jointly by State-Federal funds and encouragement of the 500-mile Ice Age Trail through Wisconsin for hiking and scenic enjoyment.

4. User fees for parks and other outdoor recreational facilities, plus direct outlays from State, local, and Federal funds. We recognize that large sums of money at all levels of government must be spent now to save and develop Wisconsin's great outdoor resources. A combination of many tax sources (excise, licensee fees, park stickers, and other taxes) are needed to finance these worthwhile programs.

5. Plans now to save Lake Michigan's shoreline from private exploitation. Again the need for Federal-State cooperation is urgent. Working people who seek weekend recreation will be the gainers.

6. Regulation of boats and billboards to protect Wisconsin's beauty. Like the modern auto, guns, the right to fish and hunt—

the boat and billboard must bow to some form of regulation, too. More jobs, not less, will result from sound conservation programs which provide space for all who seek the outdoors.

7. More parks in congested cities. While we seek more parks for remote, wilderness parts of northern Wisconsin, we also need trees, green grass, wading ponds, and open space within walking distance of city homes, especially in the sprawling suburbs of our major industrial areas.

URGENT NEED FOR IMPROVED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has recently opined on vocational education and the very great role vocational education can play, but is not now playing, in providing jobs for our young people. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I yield the floor.

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

EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING VITAL

A few figures quickly gave the dimensions of one of America's critical problems.

In the decade of the 1960's automation and related forms of technical change are expected to eliminate 2.5 million jobs. In the same decade, 26 million young people will reach working age, twice as many as in the 1950's. To give them employment, the Nation will have to create 25,000 new jobs every week. The Nation will also have to see to it that the young people are trained to handle the jobs.

How inadequately job creation and job preparation are now being accomplished is suggested by the January employment report of the U.S. Department of Labor. It shows that 13 percent of the teenagers seeking employment and 9 percent of those 20 to 25 could not find jobs in 1962. For nonwhites the problem is particularly serious. The unemployment rate runs in excess of 50 percent for urban Negro boys.

Approximately one young jobseeker out of every three enters the labor market as a high school dropout. He lacks not only job skills but the scholastic background to acquire them. A Department of Labor official who visited Milwaukee recently pointed out that apprenticeship programs were closed to dropouts and that the armed services were rejecting virtually all youngsters who "can't show a high school diploma." He said further that only 5 percent of present unskilled jobs would still exist by 1970.

Retraining is looked to as the hopeful means of preparing workers displaced by automation for new and more demanding jobs. For youths who haven't become workers in any real sense of the word, the hope lies in vocational training—training that will excite young people and hold them until they acquire skills to get and hold good jobs.

How effective is our present vocational training program? Not very, according to many studies. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls for reformation of vocational schools. A survey by the Taconic Foundation reports: "It is extremely questionable whether the training absorbed by vocational high school graduates is useful to them in getting employment and advancing on the job."

The Post-Dispatch makes a further point: Last year 44.5 percent of Federal vocational education funds went for agricultural training although barely 1 young person in 15 can look forward to farm labor. At a time when emphasis should be on orderly transfer of people from the land to the city, this allocation of funds makes little sense.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will consider nominations on the Executive Calendar; committee assignments and selection of chairmen of committees; and also a continuing resolution for the special committees whose authority has expired.

FIFTY-MILE HIKES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this Nation is periodically swept by various activities known as the latest craze. Currently, as we are all well aware, 50-mile hikes are the thing to do. Mr. President, I am not against 50-mile hikes, for those young enough and well enough conditioned they are probably a worthwhile form of exercise. And certainly anything that calls attention to the need for physical fitness should not be deprecated.

However much some of these hikes may be only publicity gimmicks, not all of them are that alone. I was particularly pleased to learn that when certain young people of my State took up this activity, for example, they added a different twist that gave an entirely new meaning to hiking.

Mr. President, the students at Northwest Center, a junior college in Powell, Wyo., realized that the first 50-mile hikers in that State would receive considerable publicity, and they decided this publicity should be put to good use. So, instead of marching for the glory of the school or club, they marched to publicize the need for clothing for the children of Teraco, Peru, a community high in the Andes Mountains. These students were well aware of the lack of adequate clothing in that remote village because a former student leader, Walter VandeVeegaete, is now serving there in the Peace Corps.

I am most happy to report that this combination of youthful spirits and humanitarian purpose found a sympathetic and enthusiastic reception in the hearts of Wyoming's citizens. These students set out yesterday to walk—in 1 day—from Powell to Cody, Wyo., and return, a distance in excess of 50 miles. And when the eight survivors, including two young women, struggled across the finish line they were met by the news that more than 1 ton of clothing had already been collected and much more was on the way. One of the marchers, incidentally, was Walter VandeVeegaete's sister, Ramona.

Mr. President, we have heard much in recent years about the sad state of our youth. They grow up in luxury, critics say, and are soft and selfish, neither understanding or caring about the traditions that made this country great. The activities of the Peace Corps and the tremendous job done by our youth, in less than normal American living conditions, was the first large-scale event to give the lie to this criticism of our youth.

I would that our adults could match our youth, not only in education, but in ingenuity in ideas.

The activities of the college students in Powell, Wyo., have served as further evidence that our national ideals are still strong in the hearts and souls of our youth, and that they have displayed typical American ingenuity to further a worthwhile cause. They have demonstrated this in preserving the national ideals which we associate with the history of our country. This is the spirit of cooperation which has helped to build the frontier, whether it be old or new. It is very much alive today.

DEATH OF OTTO D. SCHMIDT, RECIPIENT OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in 1906, while in the service of the U.S. Navy, Otto D. Schmidt reacted heroically to the explosion of a boiler aboard the U.S.S. *Bennington*. For his actions in saving the lives of a number of the crew, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, this Nation's highest military honor.

From 1922 until his retirement in 1948, Mr. Schmidt was an employee of the post office in Norfolk, Nebr. He walked some 69,000 miles carrying the mail to his neighbors in Norfolk.

Mr. Schmidt served his country honorably both as a seaman and a civilian. On Sunday, February 10, 1963, he passed away. His death reduced the number of those awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor now living to 290, only 14 of whom are peacetime recipients. Mr. Schmidt was the last living Nebraskan to be given this medal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article about Mr. Otto D. Schmidt, of Blair, Nebr., published in the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be published in the RECORD, as follows:

EX-NORFOLK MEDAL OF HONOR HERO IS DEAD

Otto D. Schmidt, 78, Blair, the only Norfolk resident ever to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor, died Sunday at Blair after a lingering illness.

Funeral arrangements are pending.

Mr. Schmidt, a retired Norfolk mail carrier, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor along with nine other Navy men for heroism in the explosion of a boiler in the U.S.S *Bennington* off the coast of San Diego in 1906.

After the explosion, which killed 113 of the 136 men aboard, Mr. Schmidt ran to the deck and helped rescue some of the wounded. He also went into the blast-wrecked boilerroom and pulled out injured men.

For a few years before World War II, Mr. Schmidt had the distinction of being the only resident of Nebraska to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor.

He came to Norfolk in 1917 and started working for the post office in 1922. He retired August 31, 1948, after having walked about 69,000 miles.

After his retirement at Norfolk Mr. Schmidt went to Blair to live.

He is survived by one son, Dale, of Santa Monica. He was preceded in death by his wife.

COMMENT ON PRAYER OFFERED TODAY BY RABBI THEODORE LEWIS, OF TOURO SYNAGOGUE, NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is most appropriate that our opening prayer this morning was offered by Rabbi Theodore Lewis, of Touro Synagogue, in my home city of Newport, R.I. Touro Synagogue is the oldest synagogue in the United States, and it is this year marking the 200th anniversary of its founding. It stands today as a symbol of an often-forgotten right in American society—the right to be different.

It is most fitting that we note this American right and this anniversary today because this week has also been designated as Brotherhood Week, a time when we pause to extend the hand of friendship and understanding to all Americans whatever their differences of race, color, or creed. Rabbi Lewis comes to us today as the living embodiment of all these traditions, handed down now through two centuries of Touro Synagogue's proud history of service to her congregation, to our city, and to the Nation.

I am happy indeed to welcome him to the Senate today.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY MONTANA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on February 7 I announced that the legislatures of six States had approved the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted for ratification last year.

Today, Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the legislatures of two more States have ratified the amendment, making eight States in all which have acted favorably. They are the State of Montana, which approved its ratifying resolution by a vote of 51 to 4, the Montana Assembly having approved its resolution 6 days earlier, on January 22, by a vote of 56 to 37; and the State of California, whose legislature, I have been informed, has approved the amendment, the California Senate by a vote of 34 to 0 and the California House by a vote of 70 to 3, final ratification becoming effective on February 7, 1963.

Mr. President, I especially wish to express my appreciation to our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who directed much time and effort in the last few weeks to working with the leaders of the Montana Legislature in obtaining favorable action on the amendment. His assistance last year in obtaining Senate action here was indispensable.

I also wish, Mr. President, to extend my appreciation to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who cosponsored, vigorously supported, and has worked equally hard for ratification of the amendment by the legislature of his State.

Also, Mr. President, I wish to express my equally warm appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE], who also have worked valiantly from the very beginning in truly bipartisan spirit to obtain the gratifying results which have occurred in their great State.

SUBSIDIZATION OF BOHEMIA LIBRE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 8, 1963, the Washington Daily News published an article entitled "Has CIA Killed Anti-Castro Mag?"

The article describes the publication Bohemia Libre and the extent of its subsidization by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. The article reports that the subsidy apparently has been withdrawn.

At one point the article states:

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help the administration either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

I do not know why my name was not used directly by the newspaper, when it was the senior Senator from Oregon who obviously was involved.

To set the record straight, I wish to say that these photographs were not furnished to me; they were offered to me. I responded by suggesting that the pictures be taken to the appropriate intelligence agencies of the U.S. Government. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that was the only appropriate response that I could make, or should have made, to the offerer of the photographs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the newspaper article, the telegram I received on January 24 from the publisher of Bohemia Libre, and my reply to him dated January 30.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 8, 1963]

DEATH OF A BOHEMIAN—HAS CIA KILLED ANTI-CASTRO MAG?

Bohemia Libre, sensational anti-Castro weekly magazine, has quit publishing and some say the CIA blew the whistle on it. At any rate, publication has been suspended. For how long, nobody knows; it may be forever.

Reports from Miami's Cuban colony are that the Central Intelligence Agency had been subsidizing it, and a couple of weeks ago, got tired. CIA itself doesn't care to discuss rumors.

Bohemia, one of the most spectacular and successful Spanish language periodicals in the Western Hemisphere when it was published in its palatial plant in Havana, idolized Castro both before and after he took over Cuba.

FERVID SUPPORT

During Bohemia's Havana days, its oddball publisher, Don Miguel Angel Quevedo, from his exotic modern office paneled in rare woods, complete with lavish washroom with lavender bidet, directed uncritical and fervid support for whatever Fidel said or did.

Bohemia gave U.S. newsmen covering Cuba—such as the famous Latin America Reporter Jules duBois of the Chicago Tribune—the hero treatment as long as they sympathized with Castro's revolution. When they became disillusioned, Bohemia exposed the same U.S. reporters as spies, agents, and colonels in the CIA.

Finally Castro's Red-glared eyes covetously focused on Bohemia's expensive printing plant and Publisher Quevedo packed his bags and barely made the plane.

So he joined the exiles.

Bohemia thus became Bohemia Libre in exile and in sheer vitriol outdid all other Castro critics (no mean feat, these days).

IRONY

It is an irony, say Cuban exiles, that Bohemia now is portrayed in the very role it accused U.S. newsmen of playing: agent of the CIA.

There's no doubt that Bohemia Libre's spectacular format and content—it's a sort of hot-licks, Police Gazette version of Life magazine—made effective propaganda in several Caribbean areas, as well as among Cuban exiles in the United States, at least until the Bay of Pigs disaster in April, 1961.

There is also no doubt that since then, it has been not so sharp a tool. But, there is also no doubt that the Red propagandists in Havana would crow over its final demise.

Here are several versions of why Bohemia hasn't been going to press recently:

1. A cartoon of the Kennedy family scheduled for page 1 on January 1, was so insulting that the CIA lowered the boom.

2. That knowledge of CIA support had leaked so that it had ruined the magazine's effectiveness.

3. That the magazine has simply lost its effectiveness anyway, since the groups it supported lost the Bay of Pigs battle.

4. That if the actual size of the CIA's subsidy of Bohemia Libre got into the hands of Congress, it would embarrass the Kennedy administration—and the CIA—just about as thoroughly as the Bay of Pigs disaster itself.

5. White House adviser Arthur Schlesinger found Bohemia Libre "too conservative," according to one of the magazine's editorial workers, who also said there were financial problems.

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help with the administration, either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

A MILLION

As to the size of the alleged subsidy; depending on who's talking, CIA spent more than a million dollars on Bohemia Libre, or spent $2,500 a week on it for a couple of years, or paid just the office rent—$2,400 a month.

Bohemia Libre may not be as dead as its recent failures to publish indicate. Bohemia's boss and staff are well known as lively and resourceful people among such interests as sugar, rum and various export firms, and recently Publisher Quevedo was in Puerto Rico reportedly trying to interest the "statehood-for-Puerto-Rico" group. Mr. Quevedo also has his eye on certain interests in the Dominican Republic and in Venezuela as possible angels.

So far, reports have it, no angels are flying.

JANUARY 30, 1963.

Mr. MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO,
Editor and Publisher,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ANGEL QUEVEDO: I have your telegram of January 24 offering me a collection of photographs on Cuba's military strength.

Although I appreciate your support of my course of action in regard to Cuba and the spirit in which your telegram was sent, I suggest that it would be more useful to make these photographs available to the agencies of the Government who are responsible for collecting intelligence concerning Cuba.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 24, 1963.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bohemia Libre magazine congratulates and supports you on Cuban military buildup offering you a sensational collection of photographs received yesterday from underground sources on Fidel Castro's military strength.

MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to my mind, this episode emphasizes the whole question of the extent of the subsidization of Cuban exiled groups and publication outlets. It raises in my mind a question of how much it is costing the American taxpayers to keep publications and political organizations of this kind operating among the Cuban refugees.

A still more serious question is, For what purposes does the CIA subsidize them? These Cuban refugees are well known in Congress as a source of allegations about both the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion and, now, the state of Soviet military forces in Cuba. Bohemia Libre modestly calls its own pictures "sensational." With the current spate of congressional reports, as opposed to administration reports, the Russian buildup, which cite alleged missile installations and alleged numbers of Russian troops in Cuba, one must assume that other Members of Congress have been offered not only pictures but countless allegations, as well, by the Cuban refugees, their political organs, and their publicity organs.

I am very much concerned about the practice of the CIA of giving financial subsidies to these organizations and publications. It raises the suspicion that they can be used by the Agency to whip up and inflame American opinion and, in effect, to influence the making of policy on Cuba in a way that the CIA is not permitted to do directly. It raises the suspicion that the taxpayers' money is being used to promote a particular policy favored by the Agency, one which may not be in keeping with or may even be contrary to that of the administration.

The CIA's relationship with the exiled groups points again, in my opinion, to the need for congressional supervision of the Agency.

Therefore, Mr. President, today I serve notice that I plan to answer to Mr. Allen Dulles magazine article of recent date in which he seeks to support the thesis that the CIA should not be subject to a watchdog congressional committee. Again I state—as I have stated for years in the Senate—that the CIA should be brought under congressional control, for the simple reason that in democratic America no agency should be given police-state powers. In effect, the CIA exercises police-state powers. They should be taken away from it, and the Democratic administration should take them away from it.

Later this week or next week I shall support that thesis by a rather detailed presentation of some CIA policies which I do not believe are in the interest of maintaining peace in the world. The CIA seeks to justify them on the ground that if one is going to beat Russia, Russian methods must be used. Mr. President, we hear this argument—"The end justifies the means"—used by too many Government agencies, State and national. In my judgment, such an argument endangers very precious principles of freedom. I cannot reconcile some of the activities of the CIA with the maintenance of precious rights of freedom to the American people. Such secrecy should be stopped.

The little experience I have recently had in connection with the pictures which were offered to me bears out my point. Apparently when a magazine or a newspaper such as Bohemia Libre offers to a Senator information which deals with the foreign policy of the United States, one cannot be sure but what it is being offered with the approval of CIA.

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech on American-Israel relations, delivered in New York City on February 10 by one of the great living Americans, Ambassador Philip M. Klutznick. For the past 2 years Mr. Klutznick has very effectively served our Government as U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Recently he resigned. I am satisfied that he resigned for two compelling reasons: One, health; the other, to take care of his personal business affairs.

In making this request, I wish to say that in the wonderful speech on American-Israel relations which he made in New York City on February 10, he has left with us an account of his views on that subject which I think every Member of Congress should read. His speech is an excellent one; and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

(By Philip M. Klutznick to B'nai Zion, New York City, February 10, 1963)

At your annual dinner a few years ago, you honored a Senator who later became President of the United States. He discussed American-Israel relationships in positive and candid terms. He amplified these views during the campaign for the presidency in a brilliant and constructive address in August 1960. In it he set some difficult and challenging goals for himself. In my 2 years of intimate concern with events inside the administration affecting American-Israel relationships, I found no gap between President Kennedy's views as he stated them earlier and his earnest and dedicated performance as our Nation's Chief Executive.

As a consequence, I am saddened by rumors attending my recent resignation. In the English Jewish press in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Israel, and through some editorial comment in the United States, it was suggested that the real cause of my resignation was my alleged dissatisfaction with the administration's attitude toward Israel. Such rumors are complete and unfounded nonsense. In a matter so vital, I would not play fast and loose with either the administration or the Jewish community. In spite of problems that have arisen and may again arise, I am proud to have been associated officially with the administration. I am convinced that President Kennedy is performing in the best interests of the United States and in keeping with a positive, progressive, and constructive policy in American-Israel relationships.

I appreciate fully your desire to do me honor. The devotion of B'nai Zion to the Jewish National Fund I have shared since boyhood. My mind goes back to the days when in countless Jewish homes the only positive symbol of hope for the realization of the dream of centuries was the little blue box—the pushka of the JNF. It is for this and reasons of long friendship that I am honored to be here tonight. I knew when your committee called on me that I would be leaving the Government service at the end of 1962. I felt that I would want to make public expression on American-Israel relationships. This was the platform from which our President chose, while he was a Senator, to clarify his views on the subject. It certainly is an appropriate place for an American, who is a Jew, to do likewise. This is especially true after 2 years in which diplomatic propriety demanded a high measure of public silence.

Let there be no illusions about my official role. My duties as a U.S. Ambassador in the United Nations concerned economic, social, and financial matters. The politically surcharged item of American-Israel relations was never assigned to me either at the Permanent Mission or during General Assembly sessions. Whatever I did in that regard was informal either at the request of my superiors or at my own suggestion. But, I was always guided by the proprieties of relationship within a government.

It has been an edifying experience for me to watch the American-Jewish community for the first time in years from a relatively detached vantage point. No less interesting has been the opportunity to observe the performance of Israel and its diplomatic corps at close quarters and in its natural habitat where we met as fellow diplomats each with unalloyed commitment to serve different though friendly countries.

It is my conclusion that the State of Israel and its personnel have matured and grown rapidly both in their understanding and in their performance in the international arena. On the other hand, the American-Jewish community seems to be floundering. We are still trying to understand our own role within this our own country and in our relationship to Israel and other Jewish communities of the world. This is not a criticism. It is a sincere observation made in good faith out of the hope that we can do something about it.

There is an enormous reaction in our Jewish community when incidents involved in American-Israel relationships arise. Therefore, trying to anticipate and to understand this relationship may be the very key to an accelerated maturity as well as a more effective role for the American-Jewish community. For all problems are by no means solved.

By now, we know that regional tensions like those in the Middle East are more difficult, if not impossible, of solution, so long as the struggle between the West and the East is unresolved or unstabilized. There is just too much room for competition for temporary favors sought and granted by

competing sides to permit solid and lasting solutions.

We are living in an unusual epoch. Big powers possess the greatest and most destructive military strength in history. But it remains virtually immobilized while big powers compete for the friendship of small, weak, and poor nations. The meek have truly inherited the earth. Any sane and reasonable attitude toward American-Israel relationships must reflect intelligently on this reality. Whether we approve of certain relationships or not, it must be expected that our Nation, in its own national interest, will maintain friendly and helpful contacts with many nations, including not only Israel but Arab, African, Latin American and Asian states which appear to merit such consideration. The peace of the world requires it.

Another aspect is self-evident but bears repetition. On many issues, Israel alines herself with the West (she has one of the best, if not the best, records of voting on the same side as the United States in the United Nations among nontreaty states). Yet Israel is sovereign and as such acts as she should in what she considers her own best interest. It is no less true of our own Nation. Israel is not a satellite of the United States or of the West; nor is the United States a satellite of Israel. Both Nations are blessed with able, intelligent and energetic leadership. Where energy, intelligence and movement are present, possibilities for occasional differences arise even while the fundamental relationship is sound and friendly.

Then again, the United States maintains relationships with many friendly nations, some of which are unfriendly to one another. The Israel-Arab situation is not unique. The United States is friendly to both Pakistan and India. Has this solved the Kashmir bitterness? The United States did its best to help set at rest the West Iria conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. During the process, Indonesia moved closer to the Soviet and the Dutch publicly berated us at home. Or one might ponder on the discomfort of trying to be a constructive friend to Portugal and to South Africa while trying to maintain the United States' historic belief in the self-determination of peoples. This has not made life with either Portugal or South Africa or, for that matter, with some of the new African nations, a bed of roses. Need one make the point more effectively than to note the occasions when the United States found itself at odds with its oldest ally, France, including the startling events of recent days, and with its close and old ally, the United Kingdom. In an overwrought, exceedingly tense and fluid world, we must expect momentary incongruities. These are usually passing phases with little impact on long-term interests and more profound mutualities.

The closest of friends among the nations of the world go through periods of disagreement, and foes find moments of agreement. Consequently there is always the possibility that differences can arise between the Governments of the United States and Israel. When in the judgment of the governments of states that are friendly, national interests conflict, it is not tragic so long as basic and fundamental relationships remain sound.

It is dangerous to elect the role of a prophet but our people have a tradition that encourages the Jew to try prophecy. There are several areas that in the future could bring about momentary or ephermeral differences between the United States and the State of Israel even with as friendly and understanding an administration as that headed by President Kennedy. I would hope that this will not happen but in today's world, anything can happen. Let us examine a few possibilities for a moment.

1. This administration believes deeply in the right and the duty of a state to defend itself from actual or threatened aggression. The recent most classic example is Cuba. At times in the past, and possibly in the future, there have been different approaches to this question by the United States and by Israel. Our Government has held that a member of the United Nations should exhaust the opportunities which that organization affords for peaceful settlement before actually shooting at the other side or shooting back in retaliation. Even in the case of Cuba, the United States took steps short of gunfire when its whole existence was threatened until the Organization of American States and the Security Council of the United Nations examined the problem.

Israel has openly expressed doubt that it can rely on the Security Council to protect it against Arab States. She has felt, not without some cause, that the Soviet veto is always available so long as the Soviet-Arab flirtation continues. Our country has felt that anticipating a veto does not justify refusing to present a case before retaliation.

It is my estimate that currently there is a better understanding on this question between the United States and Israel. Hopefully, this, with all of its implied risks, might avoid the kind of misunderstanding in the Jewish community that arose in the spring of 1962 when the Security Council censured Israel. But if Israel honestly fears its chances in the Security Council and therefore avoids initiating Security Council's processes when attacked, there is the danger of a repetition of the unhappy events of last year. If this should happen, the important thing will be to determine whether it actually affects the long-term friendly relations between the two countries or is it only an unfortunate, but nevertheless passing phase.

2. Let us take a calm but brief look at the Arab refugee problem. The United States and Israel would both like to see this problem solved. Both countries are generally moved by humanitarianism. But sovereign states cannot afford generosity if other vital interests are seriously and adversely affected. Israel properly fears for its security in the event of large scale repatriation. The sine qua non of sovereignty is the security of a nation's people. I am completely sanguine that the Kennedy administration would never deliberately and consciously encourage a plan which would endanger the security of Israel, no matter how urgent it regards the desirability of an Arab refugee solution. Yet, it is inconceivable that the Congress will continue to make substantial appropriations for UNWRA much longer without evidence that a solution is being actively sought or is on the horizon. It seems patent that both countries agree completely on three things:

(a) it is politically desirable that the problem be solved;

(b) a solution must not adversely affect the security of Israel; and

(c) that simple humanitarianism demands that the problem be solved.

But there can be differences dictated by differing exposures and accountabilities of the governments involved. These differences, if they arise, can only yield to patient and painstaking negotiation between the governments involved. The substitute of polemics will only complicate, not clarify.

Recent events tend to negate the prospect of a serious split on this issue. On a particular amendment in the General Assembly, the United States and Israel stood alone in voting against it. The reasons differed, but the fact created much comment in the halls of the United Nations. The debate in the 17th General Assembly and the voting pattern suggest that maybe basic and overt differences can be avoided. Nevertheless, I am convinced that, in keeping with his public pledges, the President and this administration will try for achievable solutions but with sincere and intelligent regard for Israel's security as well as the welfare of the refugees.

3. In another area of potential static—assistance to states not friendly to Israel—I feel more at home as a result of my recent work. One of the oldest foreign aid debates is whether a donor state should dispense aid to states unless they are allied with it formally and informally. This question loses some of its steam if foreign aid is approached from a moral point of view. The United States is the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. Like a rich and powerful individual, it has some responsibility to those less fortunate. How and to what extent it discharges this is within its own control. But, if it acts for selfish reasons alone, the decisions may be self-defeating. Just like philanthropy distributed for self-aggrandisement loses its flavor, so foreign aid used to buy friendships rarely succeeds.

On the other hand, one must candidly recognize that if foreign aid strengthens a country, such added strength can be used for better or for worse. A nation sincerely trying to develop economically has little time and less resource for military adventure. Self-defense is all it can afford at best. Some states have not yet learned this truth.

I believe that the hope for peace in the world depends on the elevation of the economic and social standards of many peoples. This is a fundamental objective of the United Nations Charter. It has symbolized the policy of the United States in this post-war era. It can be honestly argued whether aid extended to certain Arab States will blunt the edge of their antagonisms toward Israel or feed the flame of their hostility. But it cannot be disputed that the presence of a constructive U.S. influence should tend to lessen potential troubles.

This is a disturbing problem. When a state that proclaims belligerence and threatens hostilities against a neighbor is provided food and credits, it is reasonable to assume that it is strengthened to commit war even though the aid itself is directed to other channels. A historic analysis of such situations will demonstrate that there are risks in either aiding or withholding aid in a dangerous world. On the balance, the odds should favor establishing a constructive U.S. influence if possible and in elevating the economic and social level of the people themselves. It is foolhardy to do so recklessly without careful and rational examination accompanied by constant review.

So long as the United States is in the position of making choices and decisions that could affect the cause of peace and the interests of the free world, questions will continue to arise as to whether our policy at a given moment promotes the easing or heightening of tensions in the Middle East. We must be careful to relate what happens to policy objectives, to the degree of caution that is exercised and to the frequency of the review of potentialities. Perhaps, under such circumstances, any open split involving friends of Israel will be averted.

But actually, it is not these dramatic and isolated issues that provide the basic tests of American-Israel relations any more than they do of U.S. relations with many friends. The real tests rest on far more fundamental matters than votes in the United Nations or whether a little more or a little less aid should or should not have been given to a country not friendly to Israel or whether solutions for the Arab refugee problem should be sought in one way or another openly or clandestinely. The real question is will a great power help a relatively new

and struggling small state to maintain its independence and its sovereignty if its security is endangered and will it help that state overcome an adverse economic balance so it can escape national poverty.

In these matters of real life or death I speak with complete conviction. The independence and security of Israel are an element of the U.S. foreign policy. This is not a new policy. But in recent months it passed the acid test. The United States has never provided major arms assistance to the State of Israel. Other countries have done so. There has been occasional provision of small facilities but, essentially, it has been the position of the United States that while it supports the independence and security of Israel should it be in danger, others must provide the hardware with which to do it. When the President of the United States openly and frankly conceded that there was a prospect of a perilous change in the delicate balance of military power in the Middle East, he ordered that Israel receive the Hawk, the prize Western defense missile.

I was among those privileged to be in Washington to listen to President Kennedy explain what he proposed. As usual, it was an extraordinarily busy day for him. He excused himself from a major international meeting long enough to see a small group of Jewish leaders. It is regrettable that his statement was extemporaneous and no recording was made. Briefly, in excellent prose and with perfect logic, he traced the history of the U.S. policy and commitments in the Middle East. He then announced his determination to provide the Hawk to redress what might appear to be a developing and dangerous lack of military balance.

Other than President Truman's prompt recognition of Israel on its birth, this is the highlight in the relationships between the United States and Israel. In something more than words it expressed the United States vital concern with Israel's security. This is a severe and meaningful test of genuine friendship.

Now let us look at another phase. The United States has demonstrated a firm and unaltering commitment to help Israel overcome its natural handicaps and to attain a self-sustaining economic growth. It can be said to the everlasting credit of Israel's people that the confidence which the United States has placed in them has been fully justified. The economic achievements of Israel, with virtually no natural resources, stand out among all developing states. It has a great asset—the love of the people for the land—an indefinable, nevertheless, precious resource. It has another—a people that had seen the entrance to the gate of eternity and has returned from death, as it were, to reclaim an eternal land. But even with this, it has taken energy, intelligence and devotion beyond any recorded in the postwar era to achieve the measure of economic statuts which is Israel's today. If it had not secured the loans, grants, and other assistance of the United States and of other friendly states, Israel could not have reached this point in so short a time. It now faces the new challenge of the European Common Market.

Recent shocking events, not unexpected by some of us, seem to momentarily close the door of the Common Market to the United Kingdom. It may have opened the door to a bitter struggle between large economic units. In a crushing competition small nations, like Israel, dependant on a growing trade, could receive damaging blows to their economic strength. We who believe in Israel's economic future should be aware of the implications of this era of economic revolution. I am proud of our country's outgoing and forward looking attitude which solidly embraces concern with the trade problems of developing countries like Israel. In this critical and difficult period when the lifeline of such small states may be exposed to traumatic blows the protection and support of the United States may be the one great hope against economic disaster. Applying the hard core test of economic aid, it can be said that under this administration, American-Israel relationships are on a very solid footing.

Yet, the problems of Israel, no more than those of the United States, are not going to be solved in a few years. There will continue to arise challenges that will occupy the time and energy of American Jewry. It is for this reason that I am concerned with the need to clarify the role of the American Jewish community in American-Israel matters. Confusion about this can be more serious than the problems of the friendship between our two sovereign states, the United States and Israel.

As Israel matures, there should be less occasion to worry about American Jewish attitudes and problems of relationship. I begin to believe that for a period the reverse will be true unless we step back and look at ourselves deliberately and calmly. Out of the welter of recent personal experience, let me express a few brief thoughts.

The progress and security of a state like Israel committed to freedom and democracy, small though she is, is in the interest of the United States and the free world even as is the progress and security of India, large though she is. This is not an American Jewish rationalization nor an emotional catharsis. I believed this before I returned to government service; from what I have learned I believe this as much today.

Next, most American Jews have a profound emotional as well as practical attachment to the hope for a safe, secure and free Israel. This is natural and normal. It is understood by right thinking non-Jews of America, even when they do not agree with details. In this situation it is not only proper for American Jews to make appropriate representations to their government when they feel the need to do so, but it is their bounden duty in a free and democratic America where its citizens are the masters—not the servants of our government.

Whether it is with respect to American-Israel relations or any other public issue, our country can only be as strong as the interest of its people in public affairs. All but a few government officials understand this, even when they are overburdened by their own responsibilities, or even when they must disagree with representations. I counted myself a better representative of the United States when I listened and learned even things I did not agree with, than when I spent my time talking without listening.

But, there is a reciprocal obligation on citizenship. It must recognize that the Government while it should listen must ultimately do what its responsible officials deem best. Therefore, every special interest group, and there are many—our community is only one—should fight hard for what it believes, this should be within the framework of decency and respect for our Government and its personnel no matter what party is in power. Personal vendettas are unfair and improper and profitless. Today's opponent can turn up as tomorrow's best friend.

Permit me to discuss a personal experience which I believe illustrates an important general idea. In April 1962, I delivered a speech at the NJWB convention dinner on the subject that they asked me to talk about—Internal American Jewish life in the decade ahead. Afterwards, a very competent commentator criticized me for discussing what he termed "trivial considerations while I occupied a new and more august capacity," at a time when the Security Council had censured Israel in response to the Syrian complaint. Assuming that I was free to discuss classified and confidential matters of state publicity while I was serving my country, the idea that a discussion of the organization or reorganization of the American Jewish community in the decade ahead was a trivial consideration caused me to make a mental note that the first chance I had I could challenge this thoughtless, if not fatal concept.

Since I resigned my Government post some commentators have flatteringly suggested that I undertake the task of bringing greater unity to American Jewish life. Without conceding the propriety of this nomination it is interesting to observe that this was precisely the subject to which I addressed myself last April. It was the first of what I hope will be at least one or two more speeches on that topic in which I hope to delineate some of my ideas in greater detail. Let me say only briefly—that we here face a new situation in Jewish life for which history affords no apt parallel. Talk of congresses and kehillahs are a sure-fire way of destroying any constructive approach to this problem.

If we mean to create greater orderliness and produce more efficiency in our huge voluntary community we must discover a new form of art of attaining common consent without the need or force of compulsion. Instead of chewing over old and defeated ideas we need new thought and ingenuity. More of this at a later time.

No matter how serious other matters may be, it is neither trivial nor inappropriate nor untimely to consider the most fundamental issues of Jewish life in America itself. We must not permit ourselves to become a second-rate community because external problems exist that require our help for solution. I yield to no one in my hope to see Israel secure, progressive, and self-sustaining but it would be an irreparable tragedy if, in the process of achieving that end, this enormously successful and exceedingly resourceful American Jewish community lost its sense of purpose. This would be a disservice to the people of Israel and to posterity.

Irrespective of any post I ever occupy in the Jewish community, or in any other public service, I shall never consider the examination of our Jewish community and its potential a trivial consideration to be subordinated to other matters, no matter how important. If there is any criticism I could level at some of my Jewish colleagues who have gone into government or general service, it is that too many have severed themselves from active Jewish life, its hopes, and aspirations. No matter how much we believe in other causes, we have a desperate need to keep constantly concerned with whether or not this extraordinary and unique Jewish community is doing the best job that it can. Jewry wherever it is can only benefit by such an approach.

CONCLUSION

I have spoken at length. There is an accumulation of unsaid things still on my mind. These will be said at appropriate times and places—elsewhere. Doubtless, some will question the need for all this. It would have been easier and safer to have made a polite brief response. But, I consider the honor you do me would have been tarnished if I had treated it so lightly.

My friends—

1. I believe with all my being that our United States is destined (even with moments of pain) to lead this world to a peace with greater justice for all. For this I shall labor.

2. I believe in such a world that security, hopes and ambitions of small states with small numbers of people, among which is the blessed re-creation of Israel, will be more fully realized.

3. I believe that we Americans of the Jewish faith with a proud history and a splendid record of deeds have a challenge

and yes, the opportunity, to reach yet unforeseen heights in deepening our culture and in the effectiveness of our performance.

Believing all this I felt I owed it to you as well as myself to give you a glimpse at what is inside of me. How else could I thank you for the honor you bestow. Whether I deserve it or not, others decided—that I cherish it I hope you now understand. Thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart.

OREGON SENATE RESOLUTION ON SALVAGE AND SALE OF STORM-DOWNED TIMBER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial recently passed by the Senate of the Oregon State Legislature. The memorial deals with the whole problem of blown-down timber in Oregon.

As the Senate knows, last fall Oregon suffered the most severe storm in its history. The storm came in, in typhoon proportions, from the Pacific, and blew down more timber than the amount which the lumber interests of Oregon would have been allowed to cut in a year. If that blown-down timber is not harvested quickly, it will be destroyed or ruined by insects. This great wealth belongs to the American people; and sound economy calls for quick utilization and harvest of the blown-down timber.

The memorial passed by the Oregon State Senate calls this matter to the attention of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Department of the Interior. It requests expeditious action in connection with the salvage and sale of the timber, and also the construction of the necessary access roads. If the timber is harvested in time, it will be just like money in the bank; and the cost of building roads and trails to provide access to the timber will be repaid many times over by its sale, if it is harvested now.

So I hope the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior will take note of this memorial; and I hope the appropriate congressional committees will also take note of it, for it represents sound Government economy.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the standing timber which was blown down in the severe storm of October 12, 1962, is an economic loss to the State; and

Whereas the loss will become greater as a result of infestation if the timber is not salvaged; and

Whereas the downed timber constitutes a severe fire hazard; and

Whereas much of this salvageable timber is located in an economically depressed area of this State; and

Whereas the salvage operation is one well suited to the small operator; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon (1) The U.S. Department of Agriculture and Interior are urged to expedite the salvage and sale of the downed timber by:

(a) Authorizing sale of small tracts, particularly those located adjacent to existing access roads.

(b) Establishing scaling stations at central points to determine the quantity of timber removed and thus avoiding the time and cost of recruising.

(c) Authorizing local supervisors to make sales of timber up to $10,000 estimated value without lengthy public advertisement.

(2) The Congress of the United States is urged to enact any necessary enabling legislation which may be required.

(3) The Oregon Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are urged to encourage action on the part of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and to promote and support any needed legislation.

(4) Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR BEFORE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ARBITRATORS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very able address delivered in Chicago on February 10 by the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, before the National Academy of Arbitrators. In the speech, the Secretary of Labor set forth some of his views on the subject of arbitration in the field of labor disputes, and also commented on a number of other labor problems. His speech is a fine one, and I congratulate the Secretary of Labor on it.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ

A letter last week from one of the Nation's most respected citizens, Bernard M. Baruch, expresses a concern which is today much in people's minds, and very close to the center of this Academy's interests.

Referring to what he identified—with the pleasantry of understatement—as a recent "succession of labor-management quarrels," Mr. Baruch observes that "while the rights and interests of labor and of business must be respected, the rights and interests of the public deserve at least equal consideration. Both labor and business have sufficient power * * * to pursue courses which too often are at variance with the public interest. Too many of the struggles between these two are not only waged at the public's expense but are settled at it."

Recalling his recommendation after World War I that there be established a High Court of Commerce, which would "have jurisdiction over labor-management issues which the parties themselves could not resolve," Mr. Baruch concludes: "I think such a body—a Court of Labor-Management Relations—is even more necessary today."

In speaking to this proposal, I want first to set it entirely aside from that body of current reaction to what is typically identified—in a phrase which signals its predilection and prejudice—as "the labor problem."

That reaction fixes on the image of one notorious union official—despite the evidence from 3½ years now of active administration of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 that a high level of integrity and democracy obtains in organized labor as a whole.

That general reaction typically expresses a fear of excessive labor pressures in terms of alarm about inflation—despite the fact that this is the 4th year now of almost unprecedented price stability and that the rate of advance in wages has been steadily diminishing.

Or there is professed outrage about labor's broad combinations—ignoring the implications of the illustrative fact that New York City's being virtually without newspapers today results from five publications being shut down by the publishers when four others were struck by the printers.

Even the concern about economy-crippling strikes—which underlies the current alarm—must be set in context.

Lost time—and production—from strikes has, during the past 3 years, represented a smaller percentage (about one-seventh of 1 percent) of total man hours worked than during any other years since the end of the last war.

It is an illuminating, if only partially valid, comparison, that more potential man hours of production were lost in 1962 as the result of involuntary unemployment than have been lost from all strikes in the past 35 years. The public reacts more vehemently to a kick in the shins than to an attack of economic arthritis.

A separately identifiable issue was nevertheless precipitated—not for the first time, but under new circumstances—when the steel industry, basic to the entire economy, was shut down for 116 days in 1959. That same issue arose again when seven airlines were closed down suddenly, if only briefly, in 1961; when all shipping was stopped on the east coast for 18 days that same year; when all west coast ports were closed three times during 1961 and 1962; when most building construction was stopped for substantial periods last year in New York City, northern California, and the Pacific Northwest; and when a railroad here in the Midwest didn't run for 30 days last fall.

This issue has emerged even more clearly in recent weeks, with the 38-day shutdown of all east coast and gulf ports because of the longshoremen's strike, 2-month newspaper blackouts in two major cities, and the putting of production of the Polaris and Minuteman missiles under the last ditch protection of 80-day injunctions.

There have been comparable periods of crisis before—right after World War I, for example, during the sitdown strikes of the late thirties, and with the coincidence of coal, railroad and steel strikes in the late forties. To be sensitive, however, to the dynamics of labor-management relations and to the relevance in this area of broader economic and political developments is to recognize significantly new elements in the present situation.

One such element is that most of these recent controversies have involved basic issues of manpower utilization and job security. This has been true in the 1959 steel case, the 1961–62 airlines cases, the maritime cases, the longshore case, the New York newspaper case, and to a lesser degree in most of the others. In some instances this has been the result of technological developments. In others, the situation is that new competitive forces have pushed employers to manpower economies not previously considered necessary.

These developments have placed severe new strains on collective bargaining. It is one thing to bargain about terms and conditions of employment; and quite another to bargain about the terms of unemployment, about the conditions on which men are to yield their jobs to machines. To the extent, furthermore, that these problems of employee displacement can be met at all in pri-

vate bargaining, it can be only by a process of accommodation and arrangement which is almost impossible in the countdown atmosphere of the 30 days before a strike deadline.

A second element in the present situation is that the public tolerance for strikes is diminishing rapidly.

This is partly a matter of economics. With the increasing specialization of functions in the economy, and with the increasing interdependence of its units, more nonparticipants are hurt harder and faster by a shutdown than used to be the case. We have always insisted that competition—which includes competition between employers and employees—is worth what it costs the rest of us; but the cost has been going up.

It is more frequently true now than it used to be that a shutdown will hurt the public badly before it hurts one party to it or the other enough that someone has to cry uncle. Strike benefit programs for striking employees and strike insurance programs for employers are intensifying this factor. It has been a significant fact in the New York newspaper case that during most of its first month the printers were receiving up to $90 a week in strike benefits and the publishers were sharing in a substantial strike insurance program.

This is also a matter of a changing national psychology. Strikes, regardless of who is responsible for them, are waste; and it is part of the cold war psychology that the Nation's tolerance for waste is lowered. This is particularly relevant today in its relationship to strikes in the defense industries, at the missile sites and the aerospace plants; but the feeling is different only in degree when it comes to stoppages in the maritime industry, on the docks, on the airlines and railroads, and in other basic industries.

What is developing here—with the hurt of major shutdowns increasing and the national tolerance for waste decreasing—is like the change which is going on in the attitude toward war: that what has historically been the ultimate motive force of agreement has become so destructive that it can no longer be risked, or least relied on.

I conclude, even applying the necessary discount rate to trials and tribulations of the moment, that we stand today at what history will probably mark as a fairly clear fork in the development of labor-management relations in this country. Neither the traditional collective bargaining procedures nor the present labor dispute laws are working to the public's satisfaction, at least so far as major labor controversies are concerned. It doesn't matter any more, really, how much the hurt has been real, or has been exaggerated. A decision has been made, and that decision is that if collective bargaining can't produce peaceable settlements of these controversies, the public will.

I agree with that decision. I assert, however, along with the public interest in avoiding crippling shutdowns in critical industries, the at least equal public interest in preserving to the ultimate practicable extent the private decisionmaking process. And I am convinced that free, private collective bargaining can be made to work so that it will meet this demand upon it.

I see the present period as a holding period, during which this possibility is being given, in the lawyer's phrase, its last clear chance.

This is the real significance, as I see it, of the record of the Federal Government's unusual participation recently in a number of the major disputes which have developed. This is a record with which I profess some familiarity—the familiarity, roughly, an egg has with an eggbeater.

It is a record, essentially, of improvisation.

Settlement of the last round of contract disputes in the airline industry (not yet quite completed) took over 2 years, and involved the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Under Secretary of Labor, the National Mediation Board, a Special Presidential Commission, nine Presidential Emergency Boards, and three Boards of Arbitration—a total of 39 public representatives. That this meant part-time employment to 24 members of this academy will not, I think, commend it to many of you as a wholly satisfactory, or efficient government procedure.

In the recent longshore case, the public participants, during its 12-month course, were the President, the Secretary of Labor, an Assistant Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, his deputy, 15 FMCS mediators, a Taft-Hartley Board of Inquiry, the Attorney General, the Federal district court, the mayors of numerous port cities, a Special Presidential Board which was appointed but never convened, and another special board under the chairmanship of a U.S. Senator.

There were times, in the course of these marathons of maneuver, when the only promise for parties and public participants alike seemed to be the reminder, from the Garden of Proserpine, of Swinburne's consoling thought:

> "We thank with brief thanksgiving
> Whatever gods may be * * *
> That even the weariest river
> Winds somewhere safe to sea."

Such a program of improvisation clearly offers nothing for the long run future. As each new device or expedient is used, its utility diminishes; what may work in one case because it is specatcular loses its effectiveness when it becomes commonplace. Immunities are built up to procedures and pressures which depend in large measure on the evanescent virtue of novelty.

These measures have been resorted to both because of a public demand of much greater intensity than can be generally realized, and to prevent collective bargaining from committing suicide.

There has been a good deal of discussion of this experience in terms of the enervating influence upon collective bargaining, and upon more traditional forms of legislatively prescribed procedures, of any special form of "intervention." This question is properly raised. So is the question of whether, had these steps not been taken, collective bargaining would by this time have been replaced, to a significant extent, by some form of statutory decisionmaking.

Neither question can ever be definitively answered. It is clear that in most of these cases collective bargaining, as well as the issue in the particular controversy, was on trial. The "public interest" involved was both the public interest in avoiding or ending a serious interruption of the economy and the public interest—as most of us here would see it—in preserving collective bargaining as an essentially free, private process.

I suggest, in all deference, that many of those closest to collective bargaining today—labor, management, and public representatives alike—seriously underestimate the strength of the public feeling about national emergency strikes, and the brinkmanship we have been playing in this field.

What then of the future?

There are, I think, two possibilities.

One is that another major crisis will develop, and that no sufficiently new and effective improvisation on the theme of Taft-Hartley can be devised. In that event, the very real likelihood is that there will be developments along the line of the Baruch proposal.

This suggestion is set out in somewhat more detail.

"What is needed is a court of labor-management relations which would have jurisdiction to settle strikes when, in the President's judgment, the national interest is jeopardized by their continuation and after the collective bargaining processes and the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have been exhausted. This court, composed of representatives from labor, business, and the public should have the power after hearing evidence from the contesting parties to hand down decisions binding upon both."

It is implicit in what has already been said that such a development would seem to me exceedingly unfortunate.

Such arbitration is thought of, and recommended, as a substitute for strikes. The trouble is that it would become, if provided for by statute, a substitute for bargaining.

Experience—particularly the War Labor Board experience during the 1940's—shows that a statutory requirement that labor disputes be submitted to arbitration has a narcotic effect on private bargainers, that they turn to it as an easy—and habit forming—release from the obligation of hard, responsible bargaining.

The difficulty is that in virtually every dispute one bargainer or the other feels that his chances are better, or that he can evade responsibility for a hard decision, if he lets the issue go to arbitration. No effective way has yet been devised or suggested of limiting the availability of such procedures to cases in which "the collective bargaining processes * * * have been exhausted." The record is that if arbitration is assured, the collective bargaining processes are never really used at all.

It is easy to agree that the public interest will be most fully served in a particular case by prohibiting a strike and requiring the parties to submit their dispute to a third party. But there is also the public interest in leaving as many decisions as possible to private processes.

To believe strongly and deeply, however, in the validity of free collective bargaining as an application of the basic principles of democracy and free enterprise, is to realize that it can no longer depend on the defense of a maginot-line argument that compulsory arbitration is evil. Nor does its protection lie in endless new administrative resourcefulness and maneuver.

The preservation of free collective bargaining depends on two necessary developments.

One of these, extraneous to collective bargaining as such, has to do with the health of the economy as a whole.

This involves, again, the fact that most of these recent emergency dispute cases have involved serious and difficult issues arising from the displacement, or threatened displacement, of men by machines or by new work methods. There is reason to question seriously whether large-scale problems of this kind can be satisfactorily dealt with in major industries by free collective bargaining unless the economy is developing at a rate which will give displaced employees reasonable assurance of an opportunity to find other jobs. If there is not that assurance they will probably deny their bargaining representatives the authority to negotiate for their discard.

The future of collective bargaining, free of additional legislative control, is probably linked closely to the future unemployment—or employment rate. I suspect that the future of free collective bargaining may very well depend, right now and in this connection, on the adoption of the new tax program which President Kennedy has recommended to the Congress as essential to the invigoration and strengthening of the economy.

Beyond this, the future of collective bargaining—free of the weakening effects of statutory arbitration procedures—depends upon the development of private procedures which will permit and virtually assure the settlement of major disputes in critical industries without crippling shutdowns.

There is significant evidence that this development is taking place today in a highly meaningful degree and at a rapidly accelerating pace.

There has been one feature common to most of these recent emergency dispute cases which has received all too little notice. This is that the settlements in virtually all of them have included significant arrangements for meeting, and hopefully avoiding, another crisis. This was true of the 1959–60 steel settlement, of the settlement last year in the airlines cases, and of last week's settlement in the longshore case. Substantial agreement has already been reached in the New York newspaper case regarding a new procedure, involving the participation of all papers and unions, for the bargaining 2 years from now.

Active discussion is presently going on among responsible men on both sides of the bargaining tables in most of these industries, looking for a better way to meet their problems. In a number of cases, "public" representatives have been brought into these discussions. The recent announcement of the new incentive program adopted by Kaiser Steel Co. and the United Steelworkers is only one illustration of the specific results which are already flowing from these programs. And the joint Human Relations Committee for the steel industry is meeting currently in Pittsburgh, working with an agenda of five or six issues that have emerged as potential trouble areas.

There have been similar developments in parts of the construction industry, in the meatpacking, coal, and plate glass industries, at the missile sites, between management and union (IBEW) representatives at U.S. Industries, and at numerous other companies.

What is developing here is much more than collective bargaining in the old sense of the term. This is constructive bargaining, or perhaps, even better, creative bargaining.

Although these programs vary in detail, most of them include three elements:

First, arrangements are being worked out to deal during the contract period with those problems—such as adjustment to automation—which are so involved that they cannot be dealt with during the countdown period at the end of the contract. This will provide the forums and the time to develop the new ideas which are so badly needed to meet the problems of a work force which is today in flux—ideas which will be the counterpart of such innovations, for example, as the cost-of-living and productivity increase which General Motors and the automobile workers developed a decade ago.

Second, most of these programs involve the use, in one form or another, of neutral or third parties—as advisers or consultants or factfinders. It is, in part, an illusion that there exists a public interest which is separate and distinct from the interests involved in the honest interplay within most private employer-employee relationships. The participation in these private negotiations of third persons who are "independent" in the full sense of the term offers a considerable measure of protection of the public interest and more than the actually effective public interest; in most cases—which is only in wanting a settlement, any settlement, to be reached peacefully.

The third element in most of these programs is one form or another of special arrangement for approaching as constructively as possible the crucial bargaining which will move the parties from one contract period to the next. Some of these arrangements provide for arbitration—voluntary arbitration, adjusted to the particular circumstances. Others meet the pressing need for more orderly and responsible arrangements between the several employer units which are involved, or within the union group.

Part of our problem is that we have been moving into unity bargaining of one kind or another without working out the stresses and strains within one group or the other, or both.

In addition to these significant indications of private interest in new and healthier forms of bargaining, there are encouraging signs of the responsive adjustment of government programs to facilitate this development.

Both the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the National Mediation Board are working with the parties in many instances, now, long before the contract expiration crisis arises.

We are exploring in the Department of Labor, in the Bureau of Labor Statistics and in the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, possible ways of applying more directly to particular industry and company situations what has previously been for the most part general research. Perhaps there should be developed an extension service in this area, supplying assistance comparable to that which the Department of Agriculture gives to farmers. Charged now by agreement of the longshoring companies and the ILA with making a study of their manpower utilization and job security problems—to facilitate their working these problems out before the next contract showdown—we realize that if this had been done 2 years ago, last month's debacle might have been avoided.

Perhaps it should be considered whether Government procurement contracts should require that suppliers have taken maximum steps to assure against interruptions of production—just as the equal employment opportunities program establishes norms in these procurement contracts for nondiscriminatory hiring practices.

The Missile Sites Labor Commission illustrates another kind of Government assistance in what is essentially a private program of no-strike, no-lockout bargaining.

It would be impossible to exaggerate the significance of this constructive bargaining or creative bargaining development. It has to come—if free collective bargaining is to meet its obligations, if it is to survive. I am convinced that we are at a point in the development of collective bargaining perhaps even more significant than that period in the middle or later 1940's when the submission of grievances to final and binding determination was accepted, almost suddenly, as the dictate not only of good sense but of practical necessity.

If this is true it thrusts a dual responsibility upon the members of this academy.

These emerging programs demand, if they are to be successful, the services of experienced third parties with resourcefulness, expertness, patience, and independence surpassing even what is required of an arbitrator. Interpreting a contract is an artisan's job compared with the demand in new contract development for architects. The difference is between taking things as you find them, and building something new; between being called upon for answers, and for ideas.

Finally, and beyond this:

I have meant no pretense here that whatever this is that can be called constructive or creative bargaining is something clearly identifiable. It is not. The suggestion may derive as much from the realization of new and critical need as from the recognition of actual experience. It may well be an entirely different formulation or suggestion which will eventually meet this need. There is an infinite responsibility on the members of this academy, leaders in this field, to provide that formulation or suggestion.

The established institution of free collective bargaining faces a challenge today which arises in significant part from the advances of science, the new discoveries of the technologists. It is time to wonder once again why it is that there is an apparent, in some ways ominous, preponderance today of scientific over institutional invention.

It is not, surely, that the physical scientist is wiser than his political counterpart. Is it that he is freer, less afraid to question, to probe, to propound ideas that are different? Is it that the centuries have reversed the roles, since that time when scientists were condemned as hertics for their innovations while politicians—in the higher sense—were saluted for working out democracy's beginnings? May this be democracy's ultimate testing against an alien society where the dictator's decree has no constraint upon it?

Ten days ago, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson said in New York: "We have learned that modern technology can strengthen the despot's hand and the dictator's grasp—and for that reason, if no other, we know that democracy is more necessary now than it ever was. But democracy is not self-executing. We have to make it work."

Collective bargaining is industrial democracy. We have to make it work.

SENATOR MILLER'S ROLE IN THE DEBATE ON TAXES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 3 there was published in the Chicago Tribune a very excellent article entitled "Iowan To Play Leading Role in Debate on Taxes." This article about the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] was written by Willard Edwards, and is a highly complimentary one, and, in my judgment, is richly deserved. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

IOWAN TO PLAY LEADING ROLE IN DEBATE ON TAXES—SENATOR MILLER HAS QUALIFICATIONS OF EXPERT

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—From the back row of desks in the Senate Chamber, the junior Senator from Iowa voiced a few quiet words.

In the press gallery, a veteran correspondent remarked: "We've been sort of neglecting him during his first 2 years in the Senate. But we're going to have to pay him a lot of attention when our statesmen get themselves tangled up in the tax bill this year."

With tax cutting and reform the paramount issue of the 1963 session, Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, is destined to play a leading role in floor debate on the measure although he has barely emerged from freshman status.

He's tied with four others for a position near the bottom of the seniority ladder, which largely determines the status of the 100 Senators. But he'll be close to the No. 1 spot when the Senate starts arguing the complexities of tax legislation.

TAX LAW MASTERED

MILLER has, unquestionably, a sounder background as a tax expert than any other Senator. He has mastered the practical details of tax law through service in the Internal Revenue Service, taught it in universities, argued hundreds of tax cases in court, lectured on tax law before legal audiences, written countless articles about it. He drafted an Iowa income-tax law which has been used as a model by many States.

It is not always true that the most knowledgeable Senator commands the widest audience on legislation put before the Senate. Issues fraught with politics and passion are often debated at a level where little attention is paid to facts and information.

But a tax bill, when it finally emerges from committee and is scheduled for consideration, is invariably a mystery to 9 out of 10 Members in either House. They know its broad objectives, as outlined by advocates, but its intricate language, its inordinate length, baffle popular comprehension.

The Kennedy tax bill, which gives to the taxpayers in one section and takes away in another, promises to addle the legislative mind more than any similar proposal in many years. Skilled interpreters will be scarce. Most Members rely upon the assurances of committee members who draft the measure but a deep division of opinion has already developed in this group, which numbers only 8 percent of the entire membership, in both Houses. Confusion will thus be compounded.

RUSHED THROUGH HOUSE

The House usually speeds tax bills to passage under a gag rule which forbids floor amendments. The pace in the Senate is more leisurely, permitting extended debate and revision of the measure.

Into this situation, MILLER will move with the authority of one who has demonstrated that he can translate technical verbiage into laymen's terms.

It is an irony, born of the seniority tradition, that the Senator best equipped to cope with the complexities of tax legislation, will not be a member of the Senate Finance Committee which will draft it. MILLER may have to wait years before he can win a place on this 17-man group.

But the Senate will spend weeks exploring the tax bill as it is presented by the Finance Committee. Its course will be shaped by the few who have committed its every phrase to heart, who can answer all questions about its implications, defend its virtues or bare its defects. Few types of legislation lend themselves so well to influence based on expert knowledge.

AWAITS HIS OPPORTUNITY

MILLER awaits his opportunity with quiet confidence. Unlike some other Senate freshmen, he has not engaged in a frantic pursuit of publicity although his sudden appearance on the national political scene had some extraordinary features.

Eight years ago, he was a highly successful Sioux City, Iowa, tax lawyer who had never held public office. He entered politics on a modest level in 1955, won a seat in the Iowa House, moved on to the State senate for 3 years.

In 1959, he was not even considering higher office. Eighteen months later, on January 3, 1961, he became the youngest (44) U.S. Senator from Iowa in this century.

WINS IN UPSET

It was an enormous leap upward, by political standards, and it involved the seemingly hopeless task of defeating Herschel Loveless who had proved his vote-getting prowess as Iowa's first two-term Democratic Governor. Many political experts predicted an overwhelming victory for Loveless over his young Republican opponent. MILLER won by 47,000 votes out of a total of 1,238,000.

Upset victories of this nature conjure up visions of a spectacular campaigner, a swashbuckling, colorful personality, a man of overpowering exuberance who sweeps crowds to enthusiastic uproars.

There isn't a flourish in MILLER. He is forthright and vigorous in delivering a speech, punches home his points, but doesn't shout, wave his arms or rumple his hair to demonstrate passionate conviction. He has a strange theory that American voters appreciate plain talk and simple logic rather than oratorical frenzy. The Iowa variety, at least, seemed to respond.

LIKENED TO TAFT

He has in him something of the late Senator Robert A. Taft's ability to absorb an issue in its entirety, examining all the angles before coming to a conclusion. Like Taft, he is impatient with indirectness and generalities. He also has the Ohioan's capacity for hard work over long, sustained periods. He sounds something like Taft as he voices his political philosophy:

"I don't class myself as a middle of the roader. I believe in driving down the right side of the street on taxes and spending, passing to the left on human rights and education.

"Iowa is a State of contrasts, very conservative about going into debt but very progressive on such matters as higher education and mental health. Its great need is industrialization to keep younger people at home."

FIELD WIDE OPEN

The resemblance to Taft ends at this point. Taft suffered from a stiffness of attitude which made it hard for him to unbend in public. MILLER is warm and friendly, has no difficulty in mixing. In the Senate, which is slow to accept a new Member, he is gaining stature and marked as "a comer" by both Republicans and Democrats. Only 46, young by Senate standards, the field is wide open to him in the years to come. He could be the "Mr. Republican" of the future.

What precipitated him into politics? His answer was a familiar one—he got to thinking about it during the war.

The same response has been volunteered by many of the younger Members of Congress, ex-servicemen in their thirties and forties who are changing the face of the National Legislature, particularly in the minority party. The senseless destruction of World War II obviously provoked many young men in uniform to serious reflections about the nature of government and the men who ran it.

They betray a common concern—the future of their children in a society which will be paying heavily for the spendthrift policies of this generation. MILLER and his wife, the former Isabelle (Jerry) Browning, have 4 children ranging in age from 8 to 18.

SERVED IN AIR FORCE

He served 4 years with the Air Force, winding up in the China-Burma-India theater of operations. He was a specialist in Air Force logistics and, at 27, one of the youngest instructors in the history of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff School. He is now a colonel in the Air Force Reserve.

When he left China in 1946, a Chinese lawyer friend, C. K. (Gus) Lieu, saluted him as the Senator from Iowa at formal luncheon. This incident would seem to indicate the trend of MILLER'S thinking at the time but he insists it was just a friendly joke. Fourteen years were to elapse before he was suddenly to announce his candidacy for the Senate.

Then, he had to wage three campaigns to win. In the Republican primary election in June 1960, he led a field of six candidates but failed to attain 35 percent of the total vote, required for nomination.

The campaign shifted to the Republican State convention in July, MILLER and his followers here displayed their political talents in lining up delegates to insure his nomination on the first ballot. In assessing his future capabilities as a leader, veteran politicians note MILLER'S organizational skill as an important factor.

BEATS LOVELESS DECISIVELY

He put on a 80,000-mile campaign, driving his own car 60,000 miles, beat Loveless, the Democratic Governor, decisively. The GOP did not fare well elsewhere in that 1960 campaign. Only one other Republican freshman joined MILLER in the Senate the following January.

He is a Roman Catholic, the first Republican of that faith to be elected to high office in predominantly Protestant Iowa. Baptist and Methodist ministers supported his candidacy.

MILLER was born near Wilson and Ashland Avenues on Chicago's north side. When he was 6, his father, a Cudahy Packing Co. plant manager, moved the family to Wilmette, Ill., where young MILLER spent his boyhood.

The delights of free enterprise (marking him for life as a fiscal conservative) were made evident to the future Senator as a boy of 10. For an investment of 50 cents, entitling him to play on the Evanston community golf course, he was able to circumvent legally the regulations against hunting for lost golf balls in the canal lining the course. Armed with fish pole and can, he was able to net and sell golf balls at a profit up to $5 per day.

SHOOTS IN MIDSEVENTIES

He has been against unbalanced budgets and deficit spending ever since. An incidental benefit was a golfing skill which enables him to shoot in the midseventies at Congressional Country Club. The only golfer in the Senate who could beat him on a good day is Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio.

When MILLER was 15, the family moved to Sioux City, a community in a State for which he conceived a passionate attachment. When he was a tax lawyer for big law firms in New York City he received inducements to become law professor at big city universities. He turned them down because he doesn't like large cities.

His first reaction to the administration's tax cut proposal was a prediction that most of its provisions would not receive congressional approval.

"It may look like something for nothing but not when you examine it," he said. "It would appear to offer the American people 4 billions more to spend in the first year because of tax cuts. But the President's budget will put us almost 12 billions further into debt and shrink the purchasing power of our money by at least 8 billions.

"An inflation tax of 8 billions and a tax cut of only 4 billions doesn't look like something for nothing to me."

CALLS SOME UNFAIR

Some of the President's tax reform proposals are unfair, MILLER said.

"He would reduce the amount of the deduction for medical expenses," MILLER noted. "If anything, this should be increased. Many individuals would have the amount of their interest deductions on home mortgages reduced. This would discourage home ownership which should be encouraged."

MILLER has his own ideas about major tax cuts which he will sponsor. One of them, involving a 50-percent reduction in tax rates on increased income, is so simple and plausible that it has confounded New Frontier economists. It seems to avoid the danger of inflation which automatically makes it suspect in their eyes.

POLITICS AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 16 there was published in the Washington Star an article entitled "Politics and Foreign Relations." The article was written by Gould Lincoln. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

POLITICS AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The outrage expressed by Democratic spokesmen over Republican criticisms of the

handling of our foreign affairs by the Kennedy administration and over Republican suggestions that the United States is losing both friends and prestige abroad has a hollow sound. Hollow, indeed, when the remarks of these same Democrats over the conduct of our foreign policy by the Eisenhower administration are recalled. President Kennedy, replying to a reporter's question at his Thursday press conference regarding Governor Rockefeller's charges that the administration recently has aroused antagonism among three of our allies—Britain, France, and Canada—said: "Whenever the United States has a disagreement with a foreign country it is a mistake always to assume the United States is wrong." The President couldn't be more right, either, when it comes to disagreements with nations which are our friends or with nations which are our enemies.

What was the attitude, however, of President Kennedy, of Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, of the Democratic Advisory Council (which included many of the most prominent figures in the Democratic Party) regarding the Eisenhower administration and its dealings with friend or foe? What did they have to say about the failures of the United States? They heaped criticism for years on the Republican President for, as they said, loss of friends and loss of U.S. prestige abroad. Where was the rush to the defense of this country? Or did these spokesmen lay the blame on General Eisenhower, his Secretaries of State—the late John Foster Dulles and Christian Herter? What was President Kennedy saying about the conduct of foreign affairs during the 1960 election campaign, and where did he place the blame? Who was accused of "brushing things under the rug" in those days?

STEVENSON CRITICISM

What happened in May 1960, when the U–2 incident occurred and Nikita Khrushchev broke up the planned summit meeting, where the East and West leaders were to discuss important issues? After Mr. Khrushchev made two demands on the United States—that it apologize for the U–2 flight over Russia—and that we try "those responsible for the flight"—the then Senator Kennedy and later Democratic candidate for President was quoted as saying that "we might have apologized" in an effort to save the summit meeting. This Senator Kennedy denied, and explained what he really meant was that we might have "expressed regret."

Mr. Stevenson, former Democratic candidate for President and at the time again a possibility for a third nomination, spoke up in much more critical terms. In a speech in Chicago he said: "Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demands and wild charges. The hard and inescapable facts are that this administration (Mr. Eisenhower's) played into Khrushchev's hands."

Speaking in Cincinnati, Ohio, in October 1960, after he had been nominated for President, Senator Kennedy implied that if he had been President during the preceding 4 years, Fidel Castro would not have been ruling the roost in Havana. He said that in 1958 trouble might have been averted in Cuba if we had supplied substantial economic aid. He was attacking at the time his Republican opponent, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, because on visits to Cuba in 1955 and 1958 he failed to understand what was about to happen in the island Republic.

REPUBLICAN QUESTIONS

The Republicans today are asking Mr. Kennedy why he failed to do anything about Mr. Castro and his Communist government in April 1961 after he had become President and permitted the disastrous invasion attempt by the Cuban Freedom Fighters at the Bay of Pigs. They are suggesting that Cuba continues to remain a Communist bastion in the Western Hemisphere, able to help spread subversion and revolution in other Latin American countries. They point out that parts of the Russian Red army continue on the island. And they charge that the military buildup in Cuba with Russian aid has gone ahead notwithstanding President Kennedy's strong stand in October 1962 when he threw a naval blockade about Cuba. Democratic spokesmen object strenuously to the Republican comments.

A recent joint statement by the Republican congressional leaders that the Kennedy administration has been inept in its treatment of Britain, France and Canada charges that "The standing of the United States with our three historic allies is far below the plateau of prestige promised by Mr. Kennedy in the 1960 campaign." Anti-American sentiment, they said, has been sweeping these three countries. In France, President de Gaulle claims that Europe cannot count on the United States to use nuclear force in the event of attack on the Continent by the Soviet Union. In England the people were angered by our canceling of the Skybolt missile program, on which they had counted for defense, without proper warning. And more recently, the Canadian Government has fallen because of a needless public statement by the Kennedy administration. Again Democratic spokesmen are charging the Republicans with playing politics.

THE PROPOSED TAX CUT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Tax Cut—Yes, but How?" The editorial was written by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and was published in the February 1963 issue of Nation's Agriculture, a publication of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Certainly the editorial is most relevant at this time.

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

A TAX CUT—YES, BUT HOW?

(By Charles B. Shuman)

"You can't eat your cake and have it too."

Apparently the administration, most labor leaders and many business organizations think they have found a way to eat cake as a steady diet—cut taxes but continue Government spending at the same breakneck pace. That is the formula, so we are told, for economic growth and a reduction in unemployment. The theory—consumers will use their tax savings to spend the Nation into prosperity. The higher income thus generated would result in more income tax revenue, even at the lower rate, so they say.

The only thing wrong with this fancy scheme is that it won't work. The moment that corporation income tax rates are cut the labor union bosses will start a campaign to capture the windfall through higher wages and increased fringe benefits. Consumer buying is already on a pay later basis, thus much of the tax saving would be applied to debts. Very little would trickle back into the Federal Treasury and the present $300 billion national debt would skyrocket upward. Per capita income is at a high level. There is no justification for us to pass our debts on to our children but that is exactly what happens when the Federal Government persists in spending more than it takes in.

Taxes are too high and they should be reduced. But we must earn our tax cut by less spending and this can be accomplished. The excuse is often made that most of our big expenditures are for national defense, yet nondefense appropriations were increased $2.5 billion for last year. Who is there to say that we might not have better results from the foreign aid program with $1 billion less money? Much of the billions now being handed out disappears down various ratholes, either within the U.S. bureaucracy or that of foreign nations. How much of the billions being spent on pork-barrel rivers, harbors, and dams is really essential? At least a million could be shaved from farm program expenses with little or no effect on farm family income. Who knows, it may be possible to cut a few billions from the $50 billion defense budget and at the same time be stronger.

Hundreds of millions of people throughout the world have looked to the United States as the leader of the free world in their desire for a better way of life—for freedom and opportunity. Millions of our own citizens have looked with confidence to Government bonds and the U.S. dollar as standards of value. This trust and confidence is in peril. How much longer can we expect foreign nations to accept I O U's to offset an unfavorable balance of trade. Foreign governments and their banks hold $24 billion of short-term claims payable in gold against us and we have only $16 billion in gold. The Federal budget has been in balance only 6 times in the last 32 years. A tax cut without a corresponding reduction in spending would be fiscal irresponsibility at its worst.

Yes; we should cut taxes, but only as we reduce Government expenditures.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 29, 1860, Mr. E. B. Washburne, a member of the House of Representatives from Illinois, and a close personal friend of Abraham Lincoln, spoke in the House of Representatives on the occasion of Mr. Lincoln's name being placed in nomination by the Republican Party for President of the United States.

Representative Washburne's remarks in the 1st session of the 36th Congress were printed in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe. Because of the close personal association which he enjoyed with President Lincoln and with Lincoln before he became President—in fact, beginning with the year 1840—I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Representative Washburne be reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: HIS PERSONAL HISTORY AND PUBLIC RECORD

(Speech of Hon. E. B. Washburne, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, May 29, 1860)

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, said:

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party, through its proper organization, has placed in nomination for President of the United States Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois. The people, who will be called upon to pass upon that nomination, have a right to inquire into the life, the character, and the political opinions of the man who is commended to their suffrages for the highest office in their gift. The States which I in part represent on this floor having been honored by this nom-

ination, I come here to-day to speak of the personal and political history of the candidate. I have known Mr. Lincoln well for twenty years. I have known him in private life; I have known him at the bar; and have been associated with him in every political contest in our State since the advent of "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," in 1840. While I may speak with the accents of a strong personal friendship, I shall speak with the frankness of conscious truth and, I trust, without exaggeration.

Springing from the humblest ranks in life, and unaided by the adventitious supports of family or wealth, Mr. Lincoln has reached his present exalted position by the strength of his will, the power of his intellect, and the honesty of his heart. He was born in Hardin county, Kentucky, February 12, 1808; his family removed to Spencer county, Indiana, in 1816, where he passed his boyhood amid the roughest hardships and the most trying experiences of a frontier life. Without schools, and almost without books, he spent his time amid the wild and romantic scenes of the border, alleviating the hard labors of the farm by the sport of the huntsman. Of fine physical development, with a vigorous intellect, quick intelligence, ready wit, and genial character, he gave early evidences of the superiority he has since attained. His first advent into the great world, from the comparative seclusion of his frontier home, was down the Wabash and Ohio rivers in charge of a flat-boat, of a class known to all the old river men of the West as "broad-horns." These boats, laden with the productions of the farmers, floated down stream until a market was found for the cargo; and when that was disposed of, the boat itself was sold, and those in charge made their way back, in the best manner they could, to their homes. A great many persons have heard Mr. Lincoln relate, with inimitable effort, the anecdotes of his experience of that portion of his life.

In 1830, Mr. Lincoln emigrated to that State with which his great name has now become historically connected. He passed the first year in Macon County, and actively labored on a farm, where he and a fellow-laborer, by the name of John Hanks, split three thousand rails. This portion of the history of Mr. Lincoln's life gave rise to the incident in the late Republican State convention at Decatur, in Macon county, which awakened the intensest enthusiasm of that vast concourse of citizens from all parts of the State. Mr. Lincoln was present as a spectator in that convention, and was invited to take a seat upon the platform. When he had taken his seat, it was announced to the convention that John Hanks, an old Democrat, who had grown gray in the service of that party, desired to make a contribution to the convention; and the offer being accepted, forthwith two old-time fence rails, decorated with flags and streamers, were borne through the crowd into the convention, bearing the inscription: Abraham Lincoln, the rail candidate for President in 1860. Two rails from a lot of three thousand made in 1830 by John Hanks and Abe Lincoln.

The effect was electrical. One spontaneous burst of applause went up from all parts of the "wigwam." Of course, Mr. Lincoln was called out and made an explanation of the matter. He stated that, some thirty years ago, then just emigrating to the State, he stopped with his mother's family, for one season, in what is now Macon county; that he built a cabin, split rails, and cultivated a small farm down on the Sangamon river, some six or eight miles from Decatur. These, he was informed, were taken from that fence; but, whether they were or not, he had mauled many, and better ones, since he had grown to manhood.

From Macon county he removed to a settlement called New Salem, which was then in Sangamon, but now in Menard county. It was at New Salem that Judge Douglas says he first knew Lincoln; and I cannot do better than to read here an extract from one of his speeches, made in the Illinois campaign in 1858, at Ottawa:

"In the remarks I have made on this platform, and the position of Mr. Lincoln upon it, I mean nothing personally disrespectful or unkind to that gentleman. I have known him for nearly twenty-five years. There were many points of sympathy between us when we first got acquainted. We were both comparatively boys, and both struggling with poverty in a strange land. I was a school-teacher in the town of Winchester, and he a flourishing grocery-keeper in the town of Salem. He was more successful in his occupation than I was in mine, and hence more fortunate in this world's goods. Lincoln is one of those peculiar men who perform with admirable skill everything which they undertake."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, p. 69.

The last sentence in the above extract is worthy of especial note. Such a compliment extorted from his bitterest adversary has a greatly enhanced value. When Mr. Lincoln shall have undertaken the administration of the Government of this great country, the people will agree with Mr. Douglas that—

"Lincoln is one of those peculiar men who perform with admirable skill everything which they undertake."

Again: Mr. Douglas, in a speech in the Senate of the United States, January 23, 1860, refers to Mr. Lincoln as one of "the ablest and most clear-headed men" of the Republican party.

It may be proper, however, here, to let the following reply of Mr. Lincoln be heard in regard to his being a "flourishing grocery-keeper."

"The Judge is woefully at fault about his early friend Lincoln being a 'grocery-keeper.' I don't know as it would be a great sin, if I had been; but he is mistaken. Lincoln never kept a grocery anywhere in the world. It is true that Lincoln did work the latter part of one winter in a little still-house, up at the head of a hollow."

Now it is proposed, that as Lincoln spent a "part of one winter in a little still-house, up at the head of a hollow," he shall spend the whole of four winters, at least, in a large white house at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Black Hawk war having broken out, Mr. Lincoln was among the first to raise a company of volunteers for that service, and he acquitted himself with credit. Returning from that campaign, he began in earnest to devote the energies of his great intellect and superior will to the acquisition of knowledge. He first acquired a knowledge of the art of surveying, but the demand for his services in that line of business was not sufficient to support him, and he was compelled to surrender up his mathematical and surveying instruments to the sheriff, to be sold on execution.

Nothing daunted by his misfortune, then it was he commenced the study of that profession upon which he has conferred so much honor, and in which he has attained so great a distinction. Borrowing a few elementary law books, he learned the rudiments of the profession by the dim light thrown out from the fire-place of a log cabin.

In 1836 he was placed in nomination by the Whigs of Sangamon County, for a seat in the lower branch of the Legislature, which then met at Vandalia. He was elected, and gave early evidence of the superior qualities of his mind, and his skill and power as a debator. He was elected, and served two subsequent sessions. Wider avenues were now opened to him in the acquisition of general knowledge, and of the knowledge of the law, which he improved to the utmost. Changing his residence from a precinct in the county to Springfield, which had then become the capital of the State, and where he has ever since resided, he was admitted to the bar, and embarked in his profession. His success was immediate. He displayed a knowledge of the principles of the law almost intuitive, and his arguments were marked by strength of reasoning, keenness of logic, a rough eloquence, and a flow of wit and humor. His fairness to his adversary, his disdain of all the little tricks which sometimes disgrace the profession, his entire candor and truthfulness, his original and easy mode of illustration, made him all-powerful before a jury. He now ranks as the ablest and most successful lawyer in the State.

My first knowledge of Mr. Lincoln was in the great campaign of 1840. He was then an elector on the Harrison electoral ticket. He stumped all the middle and lower part of the State with great effect, traveling from the Wabash to the Mississippi in the hot months of July and August, shaking with the ague one day, and addressing the people the next, and establishing a reputation as one of the most effective and popular speakers in the State, a reputation which he has ever since maintained.

From 1840 to 1844 Mr. Lincoln devoted himself entirely to the active pursuit of his profession. The Clay campaign of 1844 brought him again into the political arena, and he headed the Whig electoral ticket in that canvass. He stumped the State, speaking to immense audiences everywhere he went, winning the applause of his friends, and extorting the admiration of his enemies, for his eloquent and masterly expositions of the principles of his party. After the defeat of Mr. Clay, and up to 1846, he was found devoted to his profession. In August of 1846 he was elected to Congress, by the Whigs of the Springfield district, to succeed Colonel E. D. Baker.

In December, 1847, Mr. Lincoln took his seat in Congress. It is but proper that his recorded opinions, while a member of Congress, upon the questions then agitating the country, should be known, and I now propose to briefly review the record made by him in the Thirtieth Congress.

In the House of Representatives, on the 3d of January, 1848, Mr. Evans, of Maryland, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the capitulation of Monterey meets with the entire sanction and approbation of this Congress, and that the terms of that capitulation were as creditable to the humanity and skill of the gallant Taylor, as the achievement of the victory of Monterey was glorious to our arms."

Mr. Ashmun, of Massachusetts, moved to amend by adding the words: "in a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States." The yeas and nays were ordered upon this amendment, and it was agreed to—yeas 85, nays 81. (Congressional Globe, volume 18, page 95.) It was strict party vote, every Whig member of the House voting in the affirmative. Among the distinguished names of those who voted for this amendment I find that of Abraham Lincoln. I find also that he voted in what would now be called good Democratic company, and with men who are at the present time bright and shining lights in the Democratic party, and who have never been denounced as traitors, taking sides with the enemy in time of war. Hon. Thomas L. Clingman, at present a Democratic Senator from North Carolina; Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, a leader of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives for several Congresses prior to the present one; Hon. Thomas Butler King, of Georgia, now a Democratic member of the Senate of that State; Hon. Daniel M. Barringer, of North Carolina, late Minister to Spain, now a Democrat; and Hon. Robert Toombs, the present able and distinguished Senator from Georgia, all of whom served with Mr. Lincoln in the Thirtieth Congress—with whom Mr. Toombs says, in a late

speech, he had an "agreeable acquaintance," and all of whom voted precisely as Mr. Lincoln did, for this amendment of Mr. Ashmun.

In regard to this vote, I prefer to let Mr. Lincoln speak for himself. In replying to a speech of Judge Douglas, in the celebrated campaign in our State in 1858, Mr. Lincoln said:

"And so I think my friend, the Judge, is equally at fault, when he charges me, at the time when I was in Congress, with having opposed our soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican war. The Judge did not make his charge very distinctly; but I can tell you what he can prove by referring to the record. You remember I was an old Whig, and whenever the Democratic party tried to get me to vote that the war had been righteously begun by the President, I would not do it. But whenever they asked for any money, or land warrants, or anything to pay the soldiers there, during all that time, I gave the same vote that Judge Douglas did. You can think as you please as to whether that was consistent. Such is the truth; and the Judge has the right to make all he can out of it. But when he, by a general charge, conveys the idea that I withheld supplies from the soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican war, or did anything else to hinder the soldiers, he is, to say the least, grossly and altogether mistaken, as a consultation of the records will prove to him."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page 75.

In a speech in this House, on the 27th day of July, 1848, Mr. Lincoln, referring to the same matter, spoke in the following language of truth, eloquence, and patriotism:

"If, when the war had begun, and had become the cause of the country, the giving of our money and our blood, in common with yours, was support of the war, then it is not true that we have always opposed the war. With few individual exceptions, you have constantly had our votes here for all the necessary supplies. And, more than this, you have had the services, the blood, and the lives, of our political brethren, in every trial, and on every field. The beardless boy and the mature man, the humble and the distinguished—you have had them. Through suffering and death, by disease and in battle, they have endured and fought and fell with you. Clay and Webster each gave a son never to be returned. From the State of my own residence, besides other worthy but less known Whig names, we sent Marshall, Morrison, Baker, and Hardin; they all fought, and one fell, and in the fall of that one we lost our best Whig man.

"Nor were the Whigs few in number, or laggard in the day of danger. In that fearful, bloody, breathless struggle at Buena Vista, where each man's hard task was to beat back five foes or die himself, of the five high officers who perished, four were Whigs.

"In speaking of this, I mean no odious comparison between the lion-hearted Whigs and Democrats who fought there. On other occasions, and among the lower officers and privates on that occasion, I doubt not the proportion was different. I wish to do justice to all. I think of all those brave men as Americans, in whose proud fame, as an American, I too have a share. Many of them, Whigs and Democrats, are my constituents and personal friends; and I thank them—more than thank them—one and all, for the high, imperishable honor they have conferred on our common State."—Congressional Globe, volume 19, page 1042.

Such being the patriotic and consistent position of Mr. Lincoln on the war, when the bill for supplies for our army in Mexico came up on the 8th day of March, 1848, his vote is, of course, found recorded in favor of the bill. (Congressional Globe, vol. 18, p. 445.)

Following this up, we find Mr. Lincoln ever watchful of the interests of the soldier, proposing to extend the bounty land act, not only so far as regarded the volunteers to Mexico, but to the war-worn veterans of 1812; thus putting in motion that great measure of public justice which was finally meted out to those brave and patriotic men. On the proposition to amend the bounty land law of February 11, 1847, which was passed before Mr. Lincoln became a member of Congress, Mr. Lincoln spoke as follows:

"If there was a general desire on the part of the House to pass the bill now, he should be glad to have it done—concurring as he did generally with the gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. JOHNSON,] that the postponement might jeopard the safety of the proposition. If, however, a reference was to be made, he wished to make a very few remarks in relation to the several subjects desired by gentlemen to be embraced in amendments to the ninth section of the act of the last session of Congress. The first amendment desired by members of this House had for its only object to give bounty lands to such persons as had served for a time as privates, but had never been discharged as such, because promoted to office. That subject, and no other, was embraced in this bill. There were some others who desired, while they were legislating on this subject, that they should also give bounty lands to the volunteers of the war of 1812. His friend from Maryland [Mr. Evans] said there were no such men. He (Mr. L.) did not say there were many, but he was very confident there were some. His friend from Kentucky near him [Mr. Gaines] told him he himself was one.

"There was still another proposition touching this matter; that was, that persons entitled to bounty land should by law be entitled to locate these lands in parcels, and not be required to locate them in one body, as was provided by the existing law.

"Now, he had carefully drawn up a bill embracing these separate propositions, which he intended to propose as a substitute for all these bills in the House, or in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, at some suitable time. If there was a disposition on the part of the House to act at once on this separate proposition, he repeated that, with the gentleman from Arkansas, he should prefer it, lest they should lose all. But if there was to be a reference, he desired to introduce his bill embracing the three propositions—thus enabling the committee and the House to act at the same time, whether favorably or unfavorably, upon all."—Congressional Globe, volume 18, page 550.

Thus it will be seen that Mr. Lincoln not only favored the bill before the House, but he proposed embracing the soldiers of the war of 1812, and also to authorize the soldier to locate his land in parcels, and not be obliged to locate it in one body; a most just and liberal proposition.

On the great question of rivers and harbors Mr. Lincoln is eminently sound and practical, and his views must meet with the approbation of the country. On the 22d of June, 1848, he made a speech in the House of Representatives, on the message of President Polk vetoing the river and harbor bill. In reply to that part of the message of Mr. Polk touching the suggestion of a change of the Constitution, he made the following observations, which should sink deep into the hearts of the American people:

"As a general rule, I think we would do much better to let it alone. No slight occasion should tempt us to touch it. Better not take the first step, which may lead to a habit of altering it. Better rather habituate ourselves to think of it as unalterable. It can scarcely be made better than it is. New provisions would introduce new difficulties, and thus create and increase appetite for still further change. No, sir; let it stand as it is. New hands have never touched it. The men who made it have done their work, and have passed away. Who shall improve on what they did?"

After conclusively replying to the arguments of the message, Mr. Lincoln proceeds with the following eminently practical suggestions:

"Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way. The tendency to undue expansion is unquestionably the chief difficulty. How to do something, and still not do too much, is the desideratum. Let each contribute his mite in the way of suggestion. The late Silas Wright, in a letter to the Chicago convention, contributed his, which was worth something; and I now contribute mine, which may be worth nothing. At all events, it will mislead nobody, and, therefore, will do no harm. I would not borrow money. I am against an overwhelming, crushing system. Suppose that, at each session, Congress shall first determine how much money can, for that year, be spared for improvements; then apportion that sum to the most important objects. So far, all is easy; but how shall we determine which are the most important? On this question comes the collision of interests. I shall be slow to acknowledge that your harbor or your river is more important than mine, and vice versa. To clear this difficulty, let us have that same statistical information which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vinton] suggested at the beginning of this session. In that information we shall have a stern, unbending basis of facts—a basis in no wise subject to whim, caprice, or local interest. The prelimited amount of means will save us from doing too much, and the statistics will save us from doing what we do in wrong places. Adopt and adhere to this course, and, it seems to me, the difficulty is cleared."—Congressional Globe, volume 19, page 709.

On the passage of the river and harbor bill by the House, August 11, 1848, Mr. Lincoln's name is found in the affirmative. (Congressional Globe, vol. 18, p. 1062.)

The tariff question was not up in Congress during Mr. Lincoln's term of service, but he nevertheless had an opportunity of putting himself upon the record in favor of protecting the great interests of American labor.

Hon. Andrew Stewart, of Pennsylvania, called "Tariff Andy," on the 19th of June, 1848, asked leave to introduce the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee of Ways and Means be instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill increasing the duties on foreign luxuries of all kinds, and on such foreign manufactures as are now coming into ruinous competition with American labor."

Upon the question being taken, Mr. Lincoln voted in the affirmative. (Congressional Globe, vol. 18, p. 852.)

Mr. Lincoln was an early and consistent advocate of the doctrine of slavery prohibition in the Territories, and of the power of Congress over them. He voted for the amendment to the Oregon bill, which extended the ordinance of 1787 over Oregon Territory, and for the bill thus amended. (Congressional Globe, vol. 18, p. 1027.)

Such is the record made by Mr. Lincoln on all the important matters before Congress while he was a member. Though serving his constituents with ability and fidelity, and to the entire satisfaction of his friends, he declined a renomination, preferring the quiet pursuit of his profession, and the enjoyments of private life, to the blandishments of office and the turmoil of political strife. Yet, such was his interest in political matters, and so deeply did he feel the importance to the country of the success of the principles he upheld, that he actively participated in the presidential contest of 1852.

The repeal of the Missouri compromise, in 1854, called Mr. Lincoln again into the field of politics, and he threw himself into the great contest of that year with all the energy of his character and the power of his

will. Stumping the State in all directions, and speaking to immense audiences, he awakened the people to the aggressive character of that legislation, and called on them to rebuke that "ruthless hand" which dared to break down that sacred compromise, and which, in the words of Senator Douglas, "was akin to the Constitution, and cannonized in the hearts of the American people."

Upon the Legislature elected that year developed the duty of electing a United States Senator, in the place of General Shields, who had voted for the Kansas-Nebraska bill. The Whigs and Anti-Nebraska Democrats constituted a majority of both branches of that Legislature, but five-sixths of this majority had been Whigs, and Mr. Lincoln was their first choice for Senator. The anti-Nebraska Democrats presented Judge Trumbull as a candidate, and Mr. Lincoln, finding after the balloting commenced that the continuance of his name before the joint convention might result in the election of the Nebraska Democratic candidate, magnanimously withdrew from the contest, and earnestly entreated his friends to elect Judge Trumbull, an anti-Nebraska Democrat, whose subsequent career in the Senate has been marked by great ability, and by strict fidelity to the conviction of those who elected him.

In 1856 the Republican party in Illinois was fully inaugurated as a State organization at the Bloomington convention, held in May of that year. Mr. Lincoln was present at that convention, and gave the weight and influence of his great name to the establishment of that party, and to a bold and emphatic declaration of principles. His speech upon that occasion was one of the most masterly efforts of his life, and carried conviction to all minds, stirring up the convention to the highest pitch of enthusiasm, and nerving every man with resolute determination. He was placed on the Republican electoral ticket as an elector at large, associated with Frederic Hecker, the German patriot and orator, who had fought for liberty in his native land, and whose eloquence awakened in the hearts of his countrymen the highest emotions of patriotism.

In that campaign Mr. Lincoln again canvassed the State, laboring with great earnestness and zeal; and it could truly be said of him, "No dangers daunted, and no labors tired."

Though Mr. Buchanan carried the State, yet the entire Republican State ticket was elected.

Great interest centered in the election of 1858—the legislature to be elected was to name a successor to Judge Douglas in the Senate of the United States. The Republican State convention for that year, to nominate candidates for State officers, with entire unanimity, and amid unbounded enthusiasm, designated Mr. Lincoln as the choice of the Republicans of the State for United States Senator, to succeed Judge Douglas. Of all the able and distinguished Republicans in the State, such was the hold of Mr. Lincoln on the party, such was the devotion of the masses to his interests, that no other name was suggested or thought of in connection with the candidacy for Senator.

I will now allude to some of the incidents of the great campaign of 1858, between Lincoln and Douglas, which assumed national proportions, and attracted the attention of all parts of the country, by the ability and vigor of the discussions, and the intense excitement which attended the canvass. All the great questions that now agitate the country were fully and elaborately discussed in their debates; and Mr. Lincoln's position on those questions can be most fully and satisfactorily understood by a reference thereto.

In a discussion at Freeport, in my own district, at which I was present, Mr. Douglas submitted to Mr. Lincoln a series of interrogatories, embracing all the various propositions involved in the question of slavery. I cannot do better here than to extract the questions and answers from a recent speech of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. Benjamin,] in the United States Senate, together with his comment thereon. Speaking of that canvass, Mr. Benjamin says:

"In that contest, the two candidates for the Senate of the United States, in the State of Illinois, went before their people. They agreed to discuss the issues; they put questions to each other for answer; and I must say here, for I must be just to all, that I have been surprised, in the examination that I made again within the last few days of this discussion between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Douglas, to find that Mr. Lincoln is a far more conservative man, unless he has since changed his opinions, than I had supposed him to be. There was no dodging on his part. Mr. Douglas started with his questions. Here they are, with Mr. Lincoln's answers:

"Question 1. I desire to know whether Lincoln to-day stands, as he did in 1854, in favor of the unconditional repeal of the fugitive slave law?

"Answer. I do not now, nor ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the fugitive slave law.

"Question 2. I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to-day, as he did in 1854, against the admission of any more slave States into the Union, even if the people want them?

"Answer. I do not now, nor ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more slave States into the Union.

"Question 3. I want to know whether he stands pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union with such a constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make?

"Answer. I do not stand pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union with such a constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make.

"Question 4. I want to know whether he stands to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?

"Answer. I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

"Question 5. I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different States?

"Answer. I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different States.

"Question 6. I desire to know whether he stands pledged to prohibit slavery in all the Territories of the United States, north as well as south of the Missouri compromise line?

"Answer. I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a belief in the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories.

"Question 7. I desire him to answer whether he is opposed to the acquisition of any new territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein?

"Answer. I am not generally opposed to honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition, accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate the slavery question among ourselves."—Debates of Lincoln and Douglas, p. 88.

"It is impossible, Mr. President, however we may differ in opinion with the man, not to admire the perfect candor and frankness with which these answers were given; no equivocation—no evasion."

Nothing can be more just than the compliments paid by the distinguished Louisiana Senator to the candor and frankness of Mr. Lincoln. It is not an unusual thing for him to extort expressions of admiration from his opponents for the fairness and candor of his arguments, both in political discussion and at the bar. It was said of him by one of the judges of our supreme court, that he stated the propositions and arguments of his adversary so fully and fairly, that but little further was necessary to be said.

It is but just, however, that Mr. Lincoln should be heard further on these questions and answers, and in explanation of them; and in the same discussion he says:

"Now, my friends, it will be perceived, upon an examination of these questions and answers, that so far I have only answered that I was not pledged to this, that, or the other. The judge has not framed his interrogatories to ask me anything more than this, and I have answered in strict accordance with the interrogatories, and have answered truly that I am not pledged at all upon any of the points to which I have answered. But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form of his interrogatory. I am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state what I really think upon them.

"As to the first one, in regard to the fugitive slave law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the southern States are entitled to a congressional fugitive slave law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing fugitive slave law, further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency. And inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of slavery.

"In regard to the other question, of whether I am pledged to the admission of any more slave States into the Union, I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add that, if slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field when they come to adopt the constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union.

"The third interrogatory is answered by the answer to the second; it being, as I conceive, the same as the second.

"The fourth one is in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that, I have my mind very distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished in the District of Columbia. I believe that Congress possesses the constitutional power to abolish it. Yet, as a member of Congress, I should not, with my present views, be in favor of endeavoring to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: First, that the abolition should be gradual. Second, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the District. And third, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. With these three conditions, I confess I would be exceedingly glad to see Congress abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the language of Henry Clay, 'sweep from our capital that foul blot upon our nation.'

"In regard to the fifth interrogatory, I must say here, that as to the question of the abolition of the slave trade between the different States, I can truly answer, as I have, that I am pledged to nothing about it. It is a subject to which I have not given that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me

to investigate whether we really have the constitutional power to do it. I could investigate it if I had sufficient time to bring myself to a conclusion upon that subject; but I have not done so, and I say so frankly to you here, and to Judge Douglas. I must say, however, that if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the constitutional power to abolish the slave trade among the different States, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power, unless upon some conservative principle, as I conceive it, akin to what I have said in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

"My answer as to whether I desire that slavery should be prohibited in all the Territories of the United States is full and explicit within itself, and cannot be made clearer by any comments of mine. So I suppose, in regard to the question whether I am opposed to the acquisition of any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein, my answer is such that I could add nothing by way of illustration, or making myself better understood, than the answer which I have placed in writing.

"Now, in all this, the Judge has me, and he has me on the record. I suppose he had flattered himself that I was really entertaining one set of opinions for one place and another set for another place—that I was afraid to say at one place what I uttered at another. What I am saying here I suppose I say to a vast audience as strongly tending to Abolitionism as any audience in the State of Illinois, and I believe I am saying that which, if it would be offensive to any persons, and render them enemies to myself, would be offensive to persons in this audience."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, pages 88, 89.

As a Republican, Mr. Lincoln thus further speaks the sentiments of his party in regard to the slavery question:

"They look upon it as a vast moral evil; they can prove it as such by the writings of those who gave us the blessings of liberty which we enjoy; and that they so looked upon it, and not as an evil merely confining itself to the States where it is situated; and while we agree that, by the Constitution we assented to, in the States where it exists we have no right to interfere with it, because it is in the Constitution; and we are by both duty and inclination to stick by that Constitution, in all its letter and spirit, from beginning to end." * * * * "The Republican party is made up of those who, as far as they can peaceably, will oppose the extension of slavery, and who will hope for its ultimate extinction."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page 19.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one word as to the Dred Scott decision, and Mr. Lincoln's position in regard to it. He says:

"I have expressed heretofore, and I now repeat, my opposition to the Dred Scott decision, but I should be allowed to state the nature of that opposition; and I ask your indulgence while I do so. What is fairly implied by the term Judge Douglas has used, 'resistance to the decision?' I do not resist it. If I wanted to take Dred Scott from his master, I would be interfering with property, and that terrible difficulty that Judge Douglas speaks of, of interfering with property, would arise. But I am doing no such thing as that; but all that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule. If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on the question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should. That is what I would do. Judge Douglas said last night, that before the decision he might advance his opinion, and it might be contrary to the decision when it was made; but after it was made, he would abide by it until it was reversed. Just so. We let this property abide by the decision, but we will try to reverse that decision. We will try to put it where Judge Douglas would not object, for he says he will obey it until it is reversed. Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it is made, and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably.

"What are the uses of decisions of courts? They have two uses. As rules of property, they have two uses. First, they decide upon the question before the court. They decide in this case that Dred Scott is a slave. Nobody resists that. Not only that, but they say to everybody else, that persons standing just as Dred Scott stands, are as he is. That is, they say that when a question comes up upon another person, it will be so decided again, unless the court decides in another way, unless the court overrules its decision. Well, we mean to do what we can to have the court decide the other way. That is one thing we mean to try to do."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page 20.

In regard to what would be the course of the Republican party towards our southern brethren in the event of its accession to power, Mr. Lincoln, addressing himself to Kentuckians, said in his Cincinnati speech:

"We mean to treat you, as near as we possibly can, as Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, treated you. We mean to leave you alone, and in no way to interfere with your institution; to abide by all and every compromise of the Constitution; and, in a word, coming back to the original proposition, to treat you, so far as degenerated men (if we have degenerated) may, according to the examples of those noble fathers—Washington, Jefferson, and Madison. We mean to remember that you are as good as we; that there is no difference between us, other than the difference of circumstances. We mean to recognize and bear in mind always that you have as good hearts in your bosoms as other people, or as we claim to have, and treat you accordingly."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page 263.

In his speech at Ottawa, Mr. Lincoln further says:

"I will say here, while upon the subject, that I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary; but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page 75.

The result of that contest is known. The Republican State ticket was triumphantly elected. Mr. Lincoln triumphed by the popular voice. The candidates for the Legislature friendly to Mr. Lincoln received more votes than the candidates friendly to Judge Douglas, and Lincoln was only defeated for Senator by an iniquitous and unjust apportionment, which stifled the voice of the majority.

The entire vote for the Lincoln candidates for the Legislature was	125,375
The entire vote for the Douglas candidates for the Legislature was	121,190
Lincoln leading Douglas in the popular vote	4,185

I have thus, Mr. Chairman, briefly adverted to the private history and public life of Mr. Lincoln, and both commend him to the country as a worthy candidate of a great and patriotic party, for President of the United States. His nomination has touched the popular heart, and has been received with approbation everywhere. The masses of the people are rallying under the flag of the man of their choice, and they will bear him to the presidential chair by an overwhelming majority. Dissatisfaction at the results of the Chicago convention now only exists among our Democratic brethren. They profess to think we did not nominate the proper man, and shed "crockodile tears" over the defeat of the nomination of a candidate whom they have hunted through his whole political career by a persistent malignity, without parallel in the history of the country. Such sympathy, under such circumstances, is no new thing. It was exhibited in the case of Mr. Clay, when General Taylor was nominated over him in 1848. The Democrats were then very much troubled at the great mistake the Whigs made in throwing overboard their great leader, Mr. Clay, and nominating the hero of Buena Vista. I know of no better reply to all this, than Mr. Lincoln made in a speech in this House on the 27th day of July, 1848:

"Mr. Speaker, let our Democratic friends be comforted with the assurance that we are content with our position, content with our company, and content with our candidate; and that, although they in their generous sympathy think we ought to be miserable, we really are not, and that they may dismiss the great anxiety they have on our account."—Congressional Globe, volume 19, page 1043.

The Republican party prefers to make its own nominations, as it is able to manage its own concerns in its own way. This party is the most imposing reunion of men for a patriotic object which this country has ever known. All good men, of all parties, who desire to see the Government rescued from its present degradation, and who would stay the further spread of slavery, can unite upon the candidates and the platform of the Chicago convention. The hope which Mr. Lincoln expressed, in the Illinois campaign of 1858, should be realized in the great contest upon which we have now entered. In his speech at Freeport, Mr. Lincoln said:

"For my part, I do hope that all of us, entertaining a common sentiment in opposition to what appears to us a design to nationalize and perpetuate slavery, will waive minor differences on questions which either belong to the dead past or the distant future, and all pull together in this struggle."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page 107.

The success of the Republican party, which has been inaugurated by the nomination of Mr. Lincoln, will bring with it great duties and grave responsibilities. A strict observance of the Constitution and an inflexible administration of the law must be its rule. It must practice the most rigid economy in every department of the Government; repress with a vigorous hand all abuses that have crept into its administration; bring about fraternal feeling; reanimate industry; clear out the pathways, and spread the sails of commerce. It must save the common Territories of the United States from the curse of slavery; reestablish the public credit, and restore confidence between man and man. The immediate reestablishment of the public good must be its first great object, and the peace and prosperity of the country will be assured.

Mr. Lincoln has been but little in public life, and he will come into the presidential chair "fresh from the people," with "no friends to reward, and no enemies to punish." He has no complications with politicians, cliques, or factions, and no outstanding promises requiring redemption. One of the people, taken up by the people, he will be the President of the people. In him there are united the elements which challenged

the confidence of the convention which nominated him, and of the people who will elect him. He is emphatically a representative man; and, by the simplicity of his manners, and the purity of his private life, he is the type of the virtues which belong to a great Republic. There is an inflexible patriotism in his heart, and he has the incorruptibility of Republican principles in his soul. He has doctrines, not hatreds, and is without ambition, except to do good, and serve his country.

In these days, when corruption, prodigality, and venality have reached the very vitals of the Government, the people have at last found an honest man to administer the affairs of the nation in the spirit in which our institutions were founded; a man whose name has ever been the synonym of probity and honor; whose reputation, in all the relations of private life, is without blemish, as his public career is without reproach. No man ever has, and no man ever can, place his finger upon a single dishonorable or improper act of his life. He stands to-day, as a private citizen and public man, unassailed and unassailable—

"An honest man, the noblest work of God."
Of no man can it more truly be said:
"His life is gentle; and the elements
So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, this is a man."

SCHOOL AID MONEY NEEDED FOR STATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the need for congressional action on President Kennedy's omnibus education bill, particularly insofar as West Virginia is concerned, is cogently argued by Mr. Phil Hirsch in his column, "Washington Watch," which appeared in the February 14, 1963, edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette.

Stating that West Virginia would greatly benefit if the administration's education bill receives congressional approval in its present form, Mr. Hirsch tells of the significance of such aid to my State:

This would be nearly four times more than the Mountain State is receiving now—

Mr. Hirsch declares, adding that—

Thousands of poor teenagers could obtain the education they need to keep off the breadline; long-deferred plans to build new elementary, secondary, and college classrooms could be launched, and there might even be a chance of reducing the vast number of youngsters throughout the State now receiving instructions from teachers who never finished college.

While Mr. Hirsch goes on to discuss the many aspects of the omnibus education bill, and what each of these could mean for the advancement of education in West Virginia, I want to especially draw attention to his concluding remarks, because they highlight an erosion in the American destiny which we, in the Congress, have the power to change:

The pending bill—

Mr. Hirsch states—

authorizes $400 million in grants to local school districts in fiscal 1964. West Virginia's share would be about $5.5 million.

In fiscal 1962, about $22 million was spent on public school construction throughout the State—

He continues, adding:

Just imagine how many double shifts and leaky, drafty, decrepit schoolhouses could have been eliminated if this figure had been $5.5 million higher.

Mr. President, I believe that the plight of education in West Virginia is the same as that which faces many other States in the Nation. But I can only speak for the Mountain State, and in so doing I can only call attention to the patriotic purposes in the national effort to develop the mental powers and abilities of every child and of every teenager in this country. In strengthening our educational system, we are giving new firmness to the greatest bulwark against the loss of our freedom to Communist tyranny.

What we do about our educational system today—to catch up with the lag in school construction, in the development and training of required numbers of teachers, and in better pay for our teachers—will shape the growth and power of our country tomorrow. If this requires a new marshalling of our resources, then let us get on with the task, for time is no longer on our side. The Russians are already graduating more engineers, technicians, and scientists each year than we are.

I would commend to the Congress, as a slogan to bear in mind during the course of debates on the President's omnibus education bill, so that the purposes of the bill are not lost in partisan ire: "A good American is an educated American."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hirsch's column printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

WASHINGTON WATCH
(By Phil Hirsch)

SCHOOL AID MONEY NEEDED FOR STATE

West Virginia will get roughly $13 million worth of Federal aid during the year beginning next July 1 if the administration's omnibus education bill passes Congress in its present form.

This would be nearly four times more than the Mountain State is receiving now. Thousands of poor teenagers could obtain the education they need to keep off the breadline; long-deferred plans to build new elementary, secondary, and college classrooms could be launched, and there might even be a chance of reducing the vast number of youngsters throughout the State now receiving instructions from teachers who never finished college.

The bill won't pass in its present form because southern, Catholic, and conservative Members of both Houses have enough votes to block several key provisions. But there is a better than even chance that a number of other provisions, almost as beneficial, will get through the congressional meat-grinder relatively intact.

The college student loan program is one of the least controversial parts of the new bill. For the past 5 years, needy graduate and undergraduate students attending private and public colleges and universities have been able to borrow up to $1,000 a year to finance their educations; most of this money has been supplied by the Federal Government. The administration wants to increase the fund in fiscal 1964 from the present $90 million to $135 million annually, and allow most students to borrow up to $2,500 a year.

The pending bill also provides Federal loan insurance. Students could borrow up to $50 million from banks and other commercial lending institutions at lower-than-market interest rates. Under a related provision of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, the Federal Government would help other students work their way through college or university; the bill sets aside $22.5 million in 1964 to cover half their pay. The rest would come from school or State funds. Undergrads could earn as much as $1,000 a year, graduate students $2,000 a year.

In 1962, West Virginia college and university students received educational loans totaling $963,203. The proposed program would increase this figure to more than $1.5 million.

There is a crying need throughout West Virginia for more 2-year colleges. The new bill makes $50 million in Federal funds available to all the States on a 50–50 matching basis; this money could be used to build junior college classrooms or pay their teachers. West Virginia's share would be approximately $750,000. The bill limits Federal aid to public junior colleges, but this provision isn't likely to stir up the church-State education feud because virtually all parochial colleges are 4-year institutions.

Another part of the bill likely to pass largely in its present form is the vocational education program. Approximately $73 million in Federal grants would be provided on a matching basis (versus $50 million this year) to finance classes for high school students, dropouts, unemployed youth, those with jobs who are interested in upgrading themselves, and handicapped workers. The money could also be spent on area vocational schools. The most significant difference between the new vocational-education program and the old one is that in future, a student could be trained for a skill needed elsewhere in his State. At present, each vocational training program must be related directly to the occupational needs of the local labor market.

The new bill increases Federal aid to public libraries sixfold, from $7½ million annually to $45 million. It also removes an existing restriction which limits aid to rural areas and to communities which have 10,000 population or less. If that ban is kept out of the final bill, Charleston's public library system could receive Federal aid for the first time. West Virginia received $152,796 in library aid during fiscal 1962. The new bill would raise that figure to more than half a million dollars in the coming fiscal year.

The most controversial parts of the President's educational package are: a basic education program for adults who haven't finished grade school; Federal loans for the construction of higher education facilities; and Federal grants to elementary and secondary school systems which could be used either for bricks and mortar or for salaries.

The basic education program, would be worth about $55,000 to West Virginia during the next fiscal year. It is opposed by southerners; they fear it would encourage Negroes to vote and seek better jobs, thus destroying the semifeudal society that still exists in many areas below the Mason-Dixon line.

The bill commits a billion dollars for construction of college and university academic facilities. One of the beneficiaries would be West Virginia University, which recently announced plans for a $30 million expansion program, but is almost certainly going to have trouble digging up the cash. If this Federal aid program was approved, it would entitle West Virginia to as much as $125 million in long-term, low-interest loans.

But construction loans are caught in a crossfire between public and private school advocates. Each group, basically, wants grants instead because they don't have to be repaid. However, both the administration

and those against Federal aid to private schools say general grants to nonpublic educational institutions are unconstitutional.

This is also the argument underlying the debate over Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. The pending bill authorizes $400 million in grants to local school districts in fiscal 1964. West Virginia's share would be about $5.5 million.

In fiscal 1962, about $22 million was spent on public school construction throughout the State. Just imagine how many double shifts and leaky, drafty, decrepit schoolhouses could have been eliminated if this figure had been $5.5 million higher.

SOVIET MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN CUBA

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on February 10, 1963, I made a report on station WGAN, of Portland, Maine, to the listeners of that area. I ask unanimous consent that that broadcast of mine be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH, CONGRESSIONAL REPORT, WGAN, PORTLAND, MAINE, FEBRUARY 10, 1963

Since reporting to you on this program 4 weeks ago there has been a great change in the atmosphere here in Washington. Four weeks ago Congress had just started its session—and that start had been in an atmosphere of great national confidence stemming from the Cuban stand that President Kennedy had taken in the latter part of October just before the November congressional elections.

I shall never forget how Americans held their heads high the morning of October 23, 1962, after the President had made his speech the night before announcing that we would fight if Khrushchev did not remove the Russian missiles in Cuba aimed at the United States. At long last, we had decided to stop Khrushchev from pushing us around. And Americans, Republicans as well as Democrats, were very proud of their Democratic President.

Much of that feeling of pride still existed 4 weeks ago when I spoke to you on this program at the beginning of the congressional session. But that is not true today. For most of that feeling has now gone from Washington—and from back in Maine and throughout the Nation, if the letters I receive are any indication of how the public now feels.

That former feeling of pride and confidence has now been replaced with a feeling of suspicion, distrust, lack of confidence, and some resentment—a feeling of resentment of the possibility of having been misled with reports that were to rosy and too sugar-coated and did not give the more disturbing facts.

Growing numbers of Americans are beginning to wonder just what is the situation in Cuba—just what did we accomplish or not accomplish back in October 1962 on the Cuban crisis—was the threat removed or not?

Now several Members of Congress are reporting that there is a heavy Russian military buildup in Cuba—some charging that all the missiles were not removed. The Kennedy administration denies the charges made by the Congressmen. The usually impeccably cool Secretary of Defense in his denial makes attacks on Members of Congress—and finds the lack of confidence so bad that he had to have a 2-hour national TV program.

The result is that again the American people are confused—they don't know who is telling them the truth—whether the Kennedy administration is telling them the truth—or whether Senators and Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, are telling them the truth in their charges of a threatening Russian buildup in Cuba.

But this much they do know. First, they know that during the Cuban crisis, Khrushchev offered a deal to President Kennedy—a deal that Khrushchev would remove the Russian missiles in Cuba if Kennedy would remove the American missiles in Turkey. Americans were proud when President Kennedy turned that deal down. But now they wondered when they read within the past few days the announcement of President Kennedy that American missiles were being taken out of Turkey. While the reason given is obsolescence, Americans still wonder if a deal wasn't actually made during the crisis—with an agreement that the American missiles would be removed from Turkey after the crisis blew over. For the American public is more intelligent than perhaps some people realize—and the American public recognizes that the American missiles in Turkey now are hardly any more obsolete than they were during the October crisis just a little more than 3 months ago. They see that whatever the reason may be—that Khrushchev has achieved his objective with our missiles being removed from Turkey as he had demanded.

They remember the Kennedy ultimatum of on-site inspection—but now they see that there was no follow through on this—and now the Kennedy administration defensively admits it can't be really sure of what is in Cuba because it hasn't made on-the-ground inspections.

There is another fact that stands out in the mind of the American public—that fact is that Senator KENNETH KEATING was so right so far in advance last year on the Russian military buildup in Cuba and the missile threat. They remember how the Kennedy administration denied his charges—how the Kennedy administration castigated Senator KEATING—how he was pilloried on the Senate floor by spokesmen for the Kennedy administration.

But they remember how subsequently the Kennedy administration had to admit how right Senator KEATING was and how wrong the Kennedy administration was at the very times the Kennedy administration was issuing heated denials and castigating Senator KEATING.

And now they see and hear Senator KEATING speaking up again and warning about a heavy Russian military buildup in Cuba—and again they see the Kennedy administration issuing heated denials and castigating Senator KEATING calling his warnings irresponsible and disgraceful.

But the memory of the American public is not so short as some would like it to be—and the feeling of the American public is that with Senator KEATING having been so right before, the American public is not quickly going to accept the claims of the Kennedy administration that Senator KEATING is wrong now—and is irresponsible and disgraceful. I think the American public is going to be inclined to believe that it is Senator KEATING who is telling them the truth and sounding a needed warning until the Kennedy administration can prove otherwise.

In fact, the American public can say now, "Why this is where we came in last year. It looks like a replay of the Keating-Kennedy match of 1962 in which KEATING scored a knockout and a victory for the American people getting the truth."

A further fact that stands out in the confusion of the charges, countercharges and denials that dominate the air in Washington now on the Cuban controversy is that the Democratic chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee ordered an investigation into determining just how great was the reported Russian military buildup in Cuba. And in that investigation the CIA Director admits that there is a threat in Cuba.

To the American public, this action of investigation drowns out the heated denials of the Kennedy administration—for the American public recognizes that the Cuban situation has gotten so bad that a member of President Kennedy's own Democratic Party has ordered a congressional investigation of the matter.

Added to this controversy which is causing the American public to have doubts about what agreements really were made on Cuba, about how much we actually did stand up—or did not stand up to—Khrushchev in October 1963—of what happened behind the scenes as compared to what was told the American people at the time—of what is the danger now—what is the military situation—what is the actual truth in the matter—and how much is actually being given of the truth to the people by the Kennedy administration.

Added to this controversy is the recent declaration of the Attorney General, brother of President Kennedy, that no air cover had even been assured for the Bay of Pigs invasion. Some Congressmen have accused the Attorney General of attempting to rewrite history in such a statement. I make no such accusation against him. But I don't see what good purpose his declaration can accomplish. Despite his denial, millions of Americans will believe otherwise.

This much we do know. First, that the Bay of Pigs invasion ended in a fiasco—that it constituted one of the most humiliating defeats our country has ever suffered. Second, we know that President Kennedy accepted full responsibility for that tragic result and acknowledged that he made all the crucial decisions that contributed to that humiliating defeat.

For such a confession and acceptance of responsibility, President Kennedy literally became a national hero. In an amazing and almost unbelievable psychological phenomenon, he thus converted a tragic blot on his record—a disastrous failure for which he is admittedly responsible—into a national badge of honor merely because he admitted his responsibility. It was almost like a general being given the Congressional Medal of Honor by the American public because he had admitted that he made grave errors that he shouldn't have and which resulted in his troops being wiped out. Quickly forgotten was the disastrous failure—it was wiped out by the mere confession of guilt.

Thus, I cannot understand why the Attorney General would raise the issue again with his denial—for what he did merely served to remind the American people of the very tragic blunder and defeat that his brother had responsibility for regardless of whether any air support had been promised and regardless of whether the lack of air support contributed heavily to that tragic defeat.

What the Attorney General did has raised serious doubts in the minds of many people as to the judgment and wisdom of the Kennedy administration—and more specifically with respect to the Attorney General himself, a question as to whether he possesses the desired wisdom and judgment of a man who aspires to succeed his brother as President.

And speaking on this subject of the American public getting the full facts and truth, since I last reported to you on this program I have had a small and minor problem on this myself. On January 24, 1963, there appeared in the Portland Press-Herald by its Washington correspondent an item about a reception given by Representative and Mrs. McIntire. That item caused some constituents to inquire of me if there was any hard feeling between Representative MCINTIRE and me.

Their inquiry was prompted by what the item stated and I quote from the item:

"Senator MUSKIE and Representative and Mrs. Tupper attended the reception with a host of other congressional colleagues."

They got the impression that either Representative MCINTIRE didn't invite me or I didn't accept the invitation since the item indicated that I was the only member of the Maine congressional delegation not attending the reception.

I want to take this opportunity to assure you that no hard feeling exists and that any indication that the quoted item may indicate otherwise is very inaccurate. For what is the truth—and what the item did not reveal—is that I did attend the reception. In fact, I was one of the very first persons to arrive at the reception at 7 p.m. on the dot—and the next morning Representative MCINTIRE called me on the telephone to express his warm thanks for my attending the reception.

What is very mystifying about the item indicating that I did not attend the reception is the fact that I shook hands with the Washington correspondent of the Portland Press-Herald as she arrived and came up to the reception line and in the presence of Mrs. McIntire. It is puzzling that she would omit my name from her story for I am sure that she recognized me when we shook hands because she called me "Senator SMITH."

VICE PRESIDENT ADDRESSES ANNUAL MEETING OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last month Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON addressed the annual meeting of the Rural Electric Cooperatives Association in Las Vegas, Nev. The Vice President pointed to the historic importance of the REA movement in this country and the tremendous effect it has had on the development of rural Amercia. A most significant part of the message was the role that the rural electric cooperative will play in the next several decades of space exploration. This is an area in which the Vice President is deeply interested and informed. He has alerted the association to a new area of development, a new role for the electric cooperative.

The Vice President's speech was a highlight of the convention and according to all reports was very well received. Mr. President, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the text of this speech printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL MEETING, LAS VEGAS, NEV., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1963

In the early years of our country, Americans then—as now—were concerned with the costs of the Federal Government. When the Capital was moved from Philadelphia to Washington, some were greatly alarmed because it required a total of seven boxes to ship the files of the U.S. Government.

That started the search for places to cut back and economize. Among others, it was decided that an ideal place to reduce expenditures was the U.S. Patent Office. The solemn recommendation was made that the Patent Office should be closed—because it was certain that the Patent Office had outlived its usefulness since everything that was worth inventing had already been invented.

That episode has been repeated many times. I do not recall it now in any spirit of ridiculing economizing on the cost of government. A compelling fact of our times is that all our people—liberals as well as conservatives—farmers as well as city residents, laborers as well as management executives—have a great and growing responsibility to join together to keep our public expenditures prudent at every level—Federal, State, and local.

Fiscal prudence is not a partisan dividing line. Neither is Government efficiency. We must continually examine and reexamine our public programs to keep them realistic and responsive to genuine needs. We must terminate those of the past which are no longer needed to make room for those which the future requires.

But too often too many are too quick to conclude that foundation programs—those programs which build a stronger base for national growth and expansion—are the expendable programs when in fact these are the indispensable activities of our Government. This is today—as it has been for a quarter century—true of the rural electrification program.

In the 1930's this Nation embarked upon a great effort to strengthen itself—and strengthen its capacity to support the cause of freedom—by building the foundation of new strength in the agricultural and rural sectors of America. In the 1950's, when we began to achieve a degree of success with those efforts, many were quick to demand that we abolish the programs responsible for that success and, while we were at it, abolish the farmers, too.

The rural electrification program has been—and continues to be—the favorite target of the wrecking crews. As one who has worked as Congressman, as Senator, and as Vice President for 25 years in support of REA, it gives me a great sense of satisfaction to come before you today as a member of an administration which has said—and will continue to say—"No" to those wrecking crews.

Coming here to the great vastness of our American West, it would be impossible for any man to agree with those who argue that the job of building rural America is a job which Americans can consider to be finished.

We are what we are in this land—as a people, as a nation, and as a political system—because we have had present throughout our history the great reserve of unused land, unused resources, and unoccupied space. The presence of these assets has meant much to the freedom of the society in which we live—and to the dignity of the individual under our society. At this point in history, we can see more clearly than ever we have seen before just how important is the development of the underdeveloped regions of our own country to the future strength and success of our country and our cause.

We are moving at a rapid rate into a new era of human adventure and exploration in the realms of outer space. It is my privilege to be associated with this national effort as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council which advises with the President of the United States on the space programs of our Nation.

In less than 5 years, our country has assumed a solid and secure place of leadership in developing the peaceful and practical uses of outer space. Where once we were, in the judgment of some, lagging behind, today we are, on the basis of clear evidence, forging ahead. Our efforts in space are in no way dictated by a policy of duplicating the activities of the Soviet. We are not engaged in a race with Communist scientists—we are engaged in a race to extend the horizons of man's knowledge and to increase the benefits which will better the lives of all men who live on this earth.

In 1962 the United States enjoyed a year of great successes. Young Americans orbited the earth for the first time. We began to communicate through space to other continents. As the year ended American rockets were flying past far-away planets and transmitting to earth our first knowledge of these other planets in our universe.

While our successes were both substantial and conspicuous, the most important works of space continue to be the steady progress we are making toward peaceful and practical uses of space technology in our own times. We are concentrating our efforts at present in three fields: weather, communications and navigation.

On weather, in the not distant future we shall have achieved technical capability of great benefit to all the nations on earth. Satellites above us will have all portions of the earth under their steady gaze 24 hours a day. We will be able to know far more than we know now about the weather of the world—and our uses of this knowledge will mean great savings of lives, property, and economic costs.

Our weather satellites will be able to give us information about the snow cover on our own continent, to make the spring runoff predictable. The same satellites will give us knowledge we do not have now about the ice fields on the Great Lakes and our inland waterways. It is estimated that such information about the St. Lawrence Waterway alone will save shippers more than $2 million each season. We will be able to prevent the loss of our timber resources through costly forest fires which now smoulder on the forest floor for many days before the presence of the fire is known. We will be able to work with the 60 nations of the world which spend more than $15 million annually trying to control the age-old plague of locusts.

The weather information from our satellites will be one of the great advances forward for agriculture throughout the world—as well as in our own country.

The prospects for our communications satellites in space also defy the imagination. We will be able to have telephone communication between all parts of all continents. We will be able to have joint television conferences between the leaders of many nations simultaneously. We will be able to transmit the written word at phenomenal rates of speed—a book the size of the Bible can be transmitted in a matter of seconds.

The advances which will come in that field of communications are innumerable.

In 1963, we expect to have operational the Transit system of navigational satellites. These satellites will permit navigators on the seas to determine their position within 0.1 mile, a degree of accuracy never before even approached. Again, the savings will be great and far reaching.

These are only a few selected examples of what the technology of the space age will mean when applied for peaceful and practical purposes of the future. More important to all of us, however, is the necessity of realizing how great will be the changes this age of space will bring to our lives, to our occupations, and to our whole society and economy in America.

The age of space which we are now entering will dwarf man's memory of the impact of the industrial revolution. Every sector and every facet of our economy and our daily lives will be altered by the impact of these next years to come. The impact will be felt by us all in terms of the demands this new age will make upon us for greater productivity, for greater capability among our people, and for the greater rewards that will come to us all.

If America is to continue to hold the leadership we have now achieved—and follow in the tradition of leadership we have

known since the beginning of our country—the next 25 years will make it necessary for us to marshal our resources to the fullest. We as a nation shall not be able to tolerate the idleness of either our natural resources or our human resources. We shall need the full total of the national strength we can command to realize the promise and fulfill the opportunities of the age of space.

In this context, as each of you here know, the day will come when a grateful America will be made glad that it has in its rural sections the rural electric cooperatives of today.

At the time the REA program was conceived and implemented in the 1930's, our objective was to light the homes of our rural sectors. That objective has in large measure been accomplished. But in strengthening the rural life of America, the REA program has built a foundation of strength on which now the structure of industrial expansion can and must be put into place. In the next 25 years, the rural electric cooperatives of the United States will be lighting the lamp of our Nation's progress.

We can see the beginnings and the implications of this here in the region where we meet.

I am thinking of the Hoover Dam and the Parker Davis project built by the generation that preceded us. The dam and project are indispensable to the continued growth of this region. Without the water provided for irrigation and hydroelectric power, this land might still be a desert, this oasis might still be without its thousands of lights.

But I am thinking too of how the intelligent development of our water resources through the dam and project is helping some of your friends and neighbors to start a new rural electric cooperative. This new cooperative will serve nearly 600 families who will receive central station electric service for the first time. One of the members of that cooperative—and probably its largest consumer—is the Atomic Energy Commission station at Jackass Flats.

The demand for electric power for the New Horizon enterprises at Jackass Flats made it possible for the cooperative to prove its feasibility and build its system. This project, where nuclear engines for spacecraft are being tested, is an example of the kind of use and development America will be making of these regions of the West.

The part which rural electric cooperatives play in these projects here is symbolic of the part that rural electric cooperatives will play in the future of these next decades of space exploration.

America is about to contemplate what is contemplated now in the exploration of outer space because a generation ago Americans wisely directed their energies and resources to development of space here on earth—the space of rural America. In this great effort the rural electrification program was from the beginning the foundation program for success of our national effort to strengthen the whole economy by strengthening the agricultural economy. Putting first things first, proceeding on a course of prudence and vision, we have through REA made our Nation stronger and made the horizons of today's generation broader.

When men seek places and means of economizing on government costs, let them turn their efforts constructively to examining the problems which keep us from realizing our full potential. Most of the costs of government domestically, and even internationally, arise not from the programs but from the failure to deal with the problems which necessitate the programs. In the world today, despite the progress of this century, poverty still abounds, disease still afflicts part of this earth's population, illiteracy still restricts the development of human minds. These are problems we can overcome. These are the problems we must overcome if we are to pay the price of freedom's survival in our own lives and in our own times.

If governments are to be prudent, they must follow their hearts without losing their heads. We living today must recognize that it is our special responsibility in the history of America and in the history of the human race to be privileged to put in place the foundations on which man's enjoyment of freedom and hope for peace will stand for centuries to come. A part of that foundation is and will always be the stability, the success, and the prosperity of agriculture and of life in the rural areas. We shall need to continue in this country to concern ourselves with that foundation of stability, success, and prosperity for rural America, and that means we must continue our support of the rural electrification program as a vital part of the foundations of our Nation's future.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt died, countless persons throughout the world vied in paying tribute to the memory of that great lady. No tribute was more moving, nor more eloquent, nor more from the heart than that delivered by her lifelong friend, the Honorable Frances P. Perkins, former Secretary of Labor. Miss Perkins, addressing a meeting of the Democratic National Committee, spoke extemporaneously. Fortunately her remarks were recorded and printed for the benefit of those who could not be present.

Mr. President, I ask that the transcript of this statement be printed at this time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may read this remarkable eulogy from one great lady to another.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT BY THE HONORABLE FRANCES PERKINS, FORMER SECRETARY OF LABOR, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEETING, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1963

Mr. Chairman, when Eleanor Roosevelt died, millions of her fellow countrymen stopped short in their tracks, and as they wrestled with a catch in their throats, they found the words to say very briefly and very simply, "she was a good woman," and that is just about what they meant when they thought it over. The most they could say, the greatest thing they could say about her was, she was a good woman. And some of the simpler among them added, "Thank God for Mrs. Roosevelt."

The simple people always thought that she was the one who had brought them the necessities of life which they were without when she walked into Washington, beside her husband to be sure, but they, understanding so little of where the relief came from, and who it was among the Senators and the Congressmen who had voted that immediate relief in a time of depression, thought that Mrs. Roosevelt had given it to them.

We lost a familiar friend. This was one thing we all knew.

Never again should we see a familiar figure climbing down a ladder into a coal mine, no longer would we see a lady looking as though she might trip on her skirts peering over into the pit of some great industrial enterprise where the flames were rising.

These were the pictures that every American had in his mind and in his heart about her. But the words never came which were what we really meant. We learned from the press that the whole world had a kind of mourning for this woman who although ill, and we all knew she was ill, had gone to her great reward. We all knew this, but we hadn't realized it. Eleanor Roosevelt was a person who primarily was effective; important because of what she was rather than what she did, and this I think, as I have thought about her afterwards, is what her great contribution was. She was—she became these things, she was the kind of person she was, and that was more important than any of the manifold and multiple things which she did and which she said.

Just think what her life was. Think how like she was to all the poor and the struggling of this country; a life begun in a very unpromising way, an orphan child, lonely, unhappy at times; kindly, but impersonally treated, shy, timid, afraid of things, striving only to be of no trouble and to be good, because otherwise she was a nuisance to her relatives.

This was a sad and self-conscious child who grew up with an inadequate education, passed around from one relative to another, finally sent to England to go to school, out of her own country, when she was only 15, a little girl.

She never went to any dancing parties in the evening. She didn't know any young people at home. She knew only some of the young girls she went to school with in England. She knew no other young people, she once said to me. She didn't know what they were like in America, and yet she came home at 18 and prepared to do her duty. Her duty was her first word in those days.

But gradually she grew, she grew, she grew. Something had happened to her. I think it was her own nature developing within her. She began to be expressive of the common ideas of human beings, of the century. The times pressed on her and she adopted, had for herself the simple ideas of American life. She became a symbol, and this was the great thing about her.

When she came to Washington she came, as you know, rather dreading the ordeal, feeling that she wasn't going to find anything to do herself, that she would spend her time, you know, being polite and entertaining people, and so forth, but nothing in particular to do, and she sent down a couple of riding horses, I remember, thinking that she would have time to ride a great deal.

Franklin Roosevelt ruined all that when he turned to her one day and said, "I wish you would go down to Arthurdale," and if you remember Arthurdale—"I wish you would go down to Arthurdale and see what it is like. I get such queer reports from it, contradictory. Will you go down and see what it is like?"

So she put on her hat and went to Arthurdale and reported upon this project of rural resettlement, and life was never the same again.

From that moment on she was constantly on the go, constantly going here, there, everywhere to see and to report on what she had seen. And this made a great difference in her life.

She was introduced to the American people at that time, who although we had known back in New York that she was a growingly important person, the American people had not known her. Yet she became a symbol, I think, to all Americans out of the work she did then and what she has done since.

She became a symbol to all Americans, and certainly to most Americans she became a symbol of those items which we regard as the right items.

She became a symbol of the rightness of the American principles which we feel, as she used to say, are somehow or other written

into our Constitution, although they are not really there in words, but we feel that these things are written into our Constitution, into our Declaration of Independence, even into our religion sometimes.

She came to be the symbol of the rightness of the American ideals of democracy, and this I think is what made her important. It was what she was, not what she did or what she said.

And the principles of democracy as she saw them and as we all see them, as we all feel them, came to her with a force that she ought to live according to those principles.

A child, a young girl, she once sat in a little company that was questioning around a round table as to whether they believed in some aspect of the creed. When asked if she believed it, a very complicated point, by the way, she said, "Oh, yes," and asked if she knew what she meant, "What do you mean by that," she answered, "Well, I believe because I live as though it were true."

And this is what Mrs. Roosevelt did with regard to democracy, with regard to equality, with regard to freedom, the freedom of individuals to be themselves, to do what they think is right, to choose their own path. This is what Mrs. Roosevelt did. She lived as though it were true.

And you can see her living it. You can see her living the life of democracy as though it were true, as though it were a real thing, as though it had to be sustained, in her attitudes and her friendliness to all kinds of people, in her respect for the great diversities that exist between us, both of our backgrounds and of our education and of our lives.

We see her living as though those diversities did not exist, and as though even though they do exist, they make no difference in our relationship one to another. We live as though we were believers in democracy, if we follow her pattern.

And she believed in equality, in equality between people, which is so indivisible. It cannot be measured. It is something which has to be recognized as an opportunity for each man, however feeble he may be or however great he may be to realize himself.

Democracy and equality and freedom, these were very important items, and she lived as though they were true. Faith in the human race, faith in the capacity of people to organize themselves, to develop themselves, to find the right thing to do was another, is another basic element in our sense of rightness of American principles, is it not? And Mrs. Roosevelt illustrated it by her daily, her regular recognition of her faith in human beings.

Her greatest single piece of work, perhaps, was the development and the writing of the Declaration of Human Rights which she did for the United Nations, and this, of course, has become not only a declaration of rights for the underprivileged people of the world but for the privileged people of the United States of America as well, and the declaration of human rights which we shall long cling to.

But it was in her living of the principles of human rights that one realized what they really are, faith in the capacity of people to develop and to rule and to become great people themselves, and hope.

Hope always she had, hope in a better world, hope in a more comfortable world, hope for a greater opportunity for people. Hope was the second, I think, layer in her set of beliefs which accompanied her concepts of democracy. And the charity, charity in judgment, charity in action, charity in thought, and charity in leadership.

All these things she had, and the great Bible tells us that faith, hope, and charity, these three are necessary to the development of a human life and of a human society. And Eleanor Roosevelt, hardly knowing how she did it or why she did it, had the capacity to illustrate in her daily life, in her regular life, in her routines, this same sense of responsibility and reliability for living a kind of life and living the basic elements of these principles.

And yet how did this girl learn all these things? How did she come from being the somewhat awkward, gawky girl to being the smiling, openhearted, easy-moving woman whom we all knew in her adult life? How did this come about?

I think it came about only by the pressures of life upon her and by her hope and capacity to do her duty. These things all grew with her as she lived and as she attempted to accept not a position of leadership but a position of following in a great ideal.

It was her reality of her life in these respects that always has impressed me. So as we look at it now and realize that the familiar friend is gone, that the notable woman, noted throughout the world, has gone, that the great, the humane and kindly soul who, everybody knew, was willing to do the smallest little chore, such as, you know, running an errand for you if you wanted a bottle of aspirin; who said, "I will get it for you," running to the drugstore to get it, these little homely things that she always did when others were too busy or too preoccupied to see the opportunity to do this sort of thing; these were the things that made here every man's friend, every woman's counselor, and every woman's clear leader in American life.

And so, as we think of her now, I remember and realize so deeply the prayer which was read at her funeral, a prayer I had long known. It is one of the ancient historic prayers, composed originally, so it is said, by St. Francis of Assisi, the man who loved the human race, also, and this is what the prayer said. It was found, by the way, in the drawer of her bedside table. That is why they read it at her funeral, interrupting the ritual to do so. It begins:

"Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred let me sow love, where there is doubt, let me sow security."

This type of prayer was definitely within her heart and mind as she thought of the world and of the people of the world and of her relationship to them. And so it was as a great woman, a woman who had achieved greatness, who was not born great, who had made herself great by opening herself to all the elements and all the ideas of her own generation, that we said goodby to her.

And I realize that as she thought about democracy, and she thought about the carrying on of the life of this country, she, too, recognized and had always experienced in political life, ever since she had married Franklin Roosevelt, she had been in political life in one way or another, and taking the humblest kind of jobs.

I remember her sitting at a desk in the headquarters in the 1928 campaign, doing the hard, dirty work of keeping track of people and their expenditures and speakers. This was Mrs. Roosevelt. Nobody in those days gave her a thought. She was just a hard worker at campaigns.

She learned politics the way you have learned politics—by doing the work of politics. And this had given her great strength not only as a person but great strength as a political leader, because she knew from the roots what would work and wouldn't work, and she was good natured and amiable about it.

And as we sit here today and think of this notable woman who made herself into a great woman by obeying her responses of a humble person to the great ideas of the period, as we think of her, I find myself saying to myself, some of the words are a paraphrase really of the words of the last chapter of the Book of Proverbs: "She maketh glad—her husband trusteth her in his heart, she will do him good and not evil all the days of her life."

And if we paraphrase this to say the world trusteth her in its heart and she will do them good and not evil all the days of her life.

And is it not our part at this time to resolve highly again that this woman shall not have lived in vain, that what she symbolized shall become the reality of American life, that we will keep her image alive and that we will hand it down to our successors, that they, too, may experience the joy of knowing a woman who both lives as well as preaches democracy, freedom, liberty, equality, and all those things which we Americans hold dear. I thank you.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Saturday, a day the Senate was not in session, was the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

It may seem strange for us to observe Lithuanian Independence Day, when Lithuania is not now independent. However, Lithuanians hold on to this idea of freedom which was first realized for them February 16, 1918, and they look forward to the day when they will again have their independence.

Lithuanians saw their chance for freedom from czarist oppression, back in 1918, and declared their independence. That became a great day with all Lithuanians. For about two decades they enjoyed their independence. They formed a democratic government, and began making progress socially and economically. But the small new state could not weather a major international crisis. In the fall of 1939, Lithuania was forced into a nonaggression pact with Soviet Russia, and in the summer of 1940 it was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Today, Lithuanians remain imprisoned in their homeland, behind the Iron Curtain. They have no contact with the free world. They are forced to work for their taskmasters, agents of Russia.

Their relatives in America are greatly concerned over the tragic plight of their brethren in Lithuania, and they loyally observe Lithuanian Independence Day, looking with hope to the future.

The United States never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, and this fact has given Lithuanians courage.

Like other prisoners of the Communists of Russia, they are looking to us for their ultimate freedom, and I feel sure we will not let them down.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, February 16, 1963, marked the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This day in 1918 was a joyous one in the history of the Lithuanian people. For as all Americans know, the birthday of a free nation, after over a century of foreign rule, is a most joyous occasion.

The tragedy of Lithuania today is that the promise of independence has been betrayed. The Russians in 1940 violated their pledge to honor Lithuanian freedom for all time and have made her a symbol of Communist oppression in our time. The United States condemned the Soviet aggression and has never formally recognized the Russian occupation of that country.

The continued observance of this occasion will serve to keep alive the determination for liberty in Lithuania so that at a later time, this day will not be an anniversary of agony, but rather a celebration of a great date in man's historic struggle for freedom.

REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there have been increasing indications of wide public interest in the subject of reform of the electoral college. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has selected this as one of its primary educational projects during the next few years, for instance, and many newspaper editorials recently advocated reform of the present system.

This public interest has been reflected in the Senate in the form of six proposed constitutional amendments on this subject, which have been introduced so far this year.

Last spring an article on this subject was published by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER in "Law and Contemporary Problems," the law review of Duke University School of Law. The title of this learned and thoughtful article is "The Electoral College: Old Reforms Take on a New Look," and at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the body of the RECORD the text of this excellent article.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE: OLD REFORMS TAKE ON A NEW LOOK

(By Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, U.S. Senator from Tennessee, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments)

INTRODUCTION

Past efforts at electoral college reform have produced little more than sympathetic amusement among hard-nosed realists of politics and government. It was bad enough to advocate a remedy which required a two-thirds vote of the Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States. But, in addition, we so-called reformers were divided among three or four different remedies. Some who supported one form of change preferred the status quo to all others. The existing system was imperfect to enough people but for too many different reasons.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-two may be the year of the big breakthrough. *Baker* v. *Carr*[1] may be the most significant development for electoral college reform in many years because it eliminates the chief current defense of our present system. Opponents of reform have generally admitted the unfairness of awarding a State's entire electoral vote to the winner of a bare plurality of its popular vote. They concede that the State unit-rule disfranchises minority party voters in each State, risks a minority President, and inflates the power of large States and urban interests within those States. But then they pointed to the beam in the reformer's eye—the make-up of State legislatures and the House of Representatives to the prejudice of urban interests. If this was a valid argument before *Baker* v. *Carr*, the same considerations should now lead to the opposite conclusion. As urban interests gain their proportionate voice in State legislatures, they should be more willing to give up their favored position in presidential elections.

[1] 369 U.S. 186 (1962). This, of course, is the famous Tennessee apportionment decision of Mar. 26, 1962.

Establishing the need for change is now the easiest part of the reformer's task, but *Baker* v. *Carr* does not help choose the form which change should take. It is now more important than ever to take a close hard look at the proposed reforms and to consider carefully what the effects of each would be.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

The 1960 Kennedy-Nixon election dramatically demonstrated some of the defects of our constitutional method of electing the President. As the electoral college lumbered like an oxcart through the selection of America's President for the space age, its machinations sounded several alarms. I do not refer to the razor-thin margin. The possibility of close elections will always be with us and in a federation of 185 million people spread from Maine to Hawaii, uncertainty and suspense will attend the final determination of a close contest under any system.

A collection of happenings throughout this crazy quilt system should have aroused us all to the need for change.[2] In Oklahoma, Mr. Henry D. Irwin, a regular Republican elector who was expected to vote for Nixon, voted instead in the electoral college for Senator HARRY F. BYRD, who, despite his merits otherwise, was not a candidate for the Presidency. Fourteen electors in Mississippi and Alabama also recorded votes for Senator BYRD. Unlike their Oklahoma counterpart, they had campaigned as unpledged electors and at least had some sort of mandate to exercise their own judgment. Louisiana's school segregation crisis produced an unsuccessful movement in its legislature to suspend the State's election laws after Kennedy had won on November 6 so that unpledged electors could then be appointed. In Illinois, charges of election irregularities were accompanied by a threat that the State's Republican election board might refuse to certify the 27 electoral votes cast by Democratic electors. An opposite result materialized in Hawaii where votes of both Democratic and Republican electors were certified to Congress.

A divided ticket of Democratic electors in Alabama baffled election statisticians and demonstrated the myth of our so-called popular vote. Voters who pulled the party lever for the Democratic ticket elected six unpledged electors who voted in December for Senator BYRD and five regular Democratic electors who voted for President Kennedy. Attempts to translate this into popular vote totals deserve passing mention because they expose the inherent fiction of the popular vote concept.

Customarily, a candidate is awarded the popular vote figure received by the highest elector on his ticket. The 6 unpledged Alabama electors each received from 322,000 to 324,000 popular votes and the Kennedy electors received about 317,000 to 318,000 votes. The 11 Republican electors each drew 237,-981 votes. Obviously, the latter group intended to register their preference for Mr. Nixon. But what of the 324,050 Alabamans who voted in varying combinations for Democratic electors? Most of them voted for the entire slate and thus were voting at the same time both for and against Mr. Kennedy. The Clerk of the House of Representatives in compiling his official statistics ignored the ticket split and merely listed the Democratic popular vote at 324,050. If the votes for BYRD were similarly treated, Alabama Democrats obviously would be recorded twice and the total Alabama vote would be correspondingly inflated. The Congressional Quarterly distributed 5/11 of the total Democratic vote to Kennedy and 6/11 to unpledged. This avoids duplication but it determines the popular vote from the electoral vote which is at odds with our basic assumption. Also, it leads to a hypothetical popular vote victory in Alabama (and the Nation) for Mr. Nixon, a fact never claimed by the most zealous of his supporters.

The only conclusion which can be drawn is that there is a great gulf between our presidential election system as it is popularly viewed and as it actually exists. Gymnastics with the Alabama vote serve no purpose in attempting to measure the popularity of either candidate. Other features of the system prevent it from being accurate in this respect. But a realistic look at this and other peculiarities of our system would be useful if it drives home to the American people the myths under which they enthusiastically flock to the polls and exercise their democratic birthright every fourth November.

A renewed demand for electoral reform followed the 1960 election in at least one sense. Those of us in Congress who have worked for reform for years hopefully renewed our efforts. There was an increase in the number of proposed constitutional amendments to the Constitution introduced in the 87th Congress, but after presiding over extensive hearings last year as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I am still waiting for evidence of substantially increased support for reform at the grassroots level.

Analysis of constitutional reforms should proceed from a realistic restatement of the constitutional foundation upon which presidential elections now rest. Unfortunately, much public discussion of the subject proceeds upon assumptions without basis in the Constitution.

The present system is embodied in article II, section 1, and the 12th amendment to the Constitution, which provide simply that the President and Vice President shall be chosen by electors appointed by each State in the manner directed by its legislature. Each State has a number of electors equal to the total of its Senators and Representatives.[3] The electors are to meet in their respective States and ballot separately for the President and Vice President, at least one of whom shall not be an inhabitant of their State. A signed list showing their votes is certified and transmitted to the seat of the U.S. Government directed to the President of the Senate.

The votes are counted in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives. A majority of the votes of the whole number of electors appointed is necessary for election. Absent a majority, the House of Representatives elects the President from the three candidates receiving the largest number of votes. In such an election, each State casts but a single vote, with a majority of the State's congressional delegation thus controlling the vote of the State. A majority of votes is necessary to elect, and in the absence of such majority the Vice President acts as President. In the absence of a majority of vice-presidential electoral votes, the Senate elects the Vice President from the two highest candidates by simple majority vote.

The two-party system has produced an extraconstitutional elective process which is virtually uniform throughout the States, with the result that few Americans are aware

[2] The incidents set forth in the next few paragraphs of the text are discussed and documented in a Library of Congress study, "Operation of the Electoral System in Selected States in 1960," which is printed in hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Nomination and Election of the President and Vice President, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 412 (1961).

[3] The 23d amendment now gives the District of Columbia the number of electors to which it would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State.

of the meager nature of this constitutional scheme and the limited extent of their constitutional rights in the election of their President. Several popular misconceptions are apparent to the most casual student.

First, the people of the United States do not elect the President in the November election.[4] He is elected by 538 individual electors[5] meeting in 50 States and the District of Columbia on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December.[6] For the past 85 years, each State has appointed its electors by popular vote but this continues only at the sufferance of State legislatures and not as a matter of right.[7]

Most people view the elector merely as a quaint procedural device for registering the will of the people. The fidelity of electors over the years has largely justified this faith but this assumption is also without legal basis.

Alexander Hamilton wrote that the electoral college system was intended to insure that the election of the Chief Executive "should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station, and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation, and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements which were proper to govern their choice." With characteristic distrust of the popular will, he added: "A small number of persons selected by their fellow citizens from the general mass will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to such complicated investigation."[8]

Hamilton's aspirations for the electors as a deliberative body were soon frustrated by the advent of the two-party system and the rise of popular democracy. Extraconstitutional devices such as pledges, statutory instructions, and the short ballot have largely guaranteed elector fidelity but there is little doubt that each elector is still constitutionally free to vote for whomever he chooses in December, regardless of the manner in which he was appointed in November.[9]

The most controversial feature of our present system is, of course, the so-called unit-rule or general-ticket method by which all of a State's electoral votes are cast en bloc for the candidate receiving a plurality of its popular votes. Like popular voting for electors and binding by pledge, this, too, is extraconstitutional. It results from our two-party system but is solely the product of State legislation. The plenary power of State legislatures resulted in a variety of methods other than election by statewide general ticket in our early history. In addition to direct legislative appointment, electors were also chosen by the people voting in districts fixed by the legislature or by a combination of electors chosen by districts and electors chosen at large. In 1796 and 1800, the Tennessee Legislature divided the State into three districts and designated three named individuals in each district to appoint electors.

We do not have to go back far to find a State legislature manipulating its system for partisan advantage in a particular election. In 1892, the Michigan Legislature adopted a district system for the purpose of splitting the State's electoral votes in the coming presidential election. The Supreme Court of the United States upheld the legislature's power and quoted with approval the following statement which had been made in 1874 by a Senate committee:[10]

"The appointment of these electors is thus placed absolutely and wholly with the legislatures of the several States. They may be chosen by the legislature, or the legislature may provide that they shall be elected by the people of the State at large, or in districts, as are Members of Congress, which was the case formerly in many States; and it is, no doubt, competent for the legislature to authorize the Governor, or the supreme court of the State, or any other agent of its will, to appoint these electors. This power is conferred upon the legislatures of the States by the Constitution of the United States, and cannot be taken from them or modified by their State constitutions any more than can their power to elect Senators of the United States. Whatever provision may be made by statute, or by the State constitution, to choose electors by the people, there is no doubt of the right of the legislature to resume the power at any time, for it can neither be taken away nor abdicated."

The system produces two sorts of objections—pragmatic and philosophical. Pragmatic objections are concerned with the mechanics of the system's operation and are addressed primarily to the retention of the office of presidential elector, the method of resolving the election when no candidate obtains a majority of electoral votes, and the potential for manipulation of the system from State to State and from election to election. Philosophical objections are addressed to the fact that our system does not insure that the President is the candidate preferred by the largest number of Americans and to the distribution of political power under the present system, as between large and small States or as between rural and urban citizens.

It is safe to say that the pragmatic objections are a concern of all proponents of change. The uncertainties and dangers inherent in the present system have no vocal defenders although there is disagreement as to whether these defects alone merit correction by constitutional amendment.

The philosophical and political aspects of the problem result from two elements of the present system: the weighted electoral votes of the States and the operation of the State unit-rule method of casting those votes. At this point we reach the principal points of division among those who advocate substantial reform. Shall the States electoral votes be retained at all? If so, what is to be substituted for the unit-rule method?

This may be somewhat of an oversimplification but it is a worthwhile basis for approaching the three principal proposals—direct national election, the district system, and the proportional system. Direct election eliminates the weighted electoral votes of the States. The district and proportional plans retain the electoral votes but differ significantly in their method and extent of eliminating the unit rule.

DIRECT NATIONAL ELECTION

When this method was proposed in the original Constitutional Convention, it was defeated by a vote of 9 States to 2. It has fared little better in Congress in the intervening years, although as early as 1826 a constitutional amendment for direct national election was introduced by Representative McManus, of New York. In 1950, when the Senate approved the proportional system, Senator Langer, of North Dakota, offered as a substitute direct popular election along with national nominating primaries. The Langer substitute was rejected by a vote of 60 to 31. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, then offered as a substitute an amendment which provided only for election by direct national vote and it was defeated by a vote of 63 to 28. In 1956, when the Senate considered the proportional-district system compromise, Senator Langer again offered an amendment for nomination and election by national popular vote. This time it was defeated 69 to 13. Senator Lehman, of New York, then offered an amendment providing only for election by national popular vote and this was rejected by 66 to 17.

The chief advantage of this proposal is obvious; it would completely eliminate the possibility of a so-called minority President, which cannot honestly be claimed for any other proposal. This term sometimes refers to a President who is elected without a majority of the popular vote although with more popular votes than any opponent. This has happened in 14 elections. It is used more frequently to refer to a President who is elected with fewer popular votes than his leading opponent. This has happened three times. In 1824, although Andrew Jackson received more popular and electoral votes than did John Quincy Adams, the latter was elected by the House of Representatives. In 1876, although Samuel J. Tilden polled 247,448 votes more than Rutherford B. Hayes, the resolution of contested slates of electors by the Electoral Commission created by the Congress resulted in Hayes being elected by one electoral vote. In 1888, although Benjamin Harrison received 90,728 fewer popular votes than did Grover Cleveland, Harrison was elected by 233 electoral

---

[4] The Tuesday next after the first Monday in November is set by Congress as the date when "* * * electors * * * shall be appointed." 3 U.S.C. sec. 1 (1958). Sec. 1 of art. II of the Constitution authorizes Congress to determine "* * * the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States."

[5] This will be the electoral vote total in 1964. In 1960 there were 537 electoral votes because of two temporary members of the House of Representatives added upon the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood. In 1964, three new electoral votes will be cast by the District of Columbia as a result of the 23d amendment, but the House membership will revert to 435, unless it is increased by Congress, which appears unlikely.

[6] The date set by Congress when electors shall meet "at such place in each State as the legislature of such State shall direct." 3 U.S.C. sec. 7 (1958).

[7] No State legislature has exercised its right to appoint electors itself since South Carolina abandoned the practice in 1860, except for the newly admitted State of Colorado in 1868 and the reconstructed State of Florida in 1876. Prior to 1828, most States did so at one time or another. Hearings, supra note 2, at 785.

[8] The Federalist No. 68, at 424 (Lodge ed. 1888) (Hamilton).

[9] Wilkinson, "The Electoral Process and the Power of the States," 47 A.B.A.J. 251 (1961). In holding that Alabama could require a pledge of a candidate for elector as a condition of his being placed on the ballot in a primary election, the Supreme Court expressly left unanswered an argument that such pledges would be enforceable if violated because of the elector's constitutional freedom to vote as he chooses in the electoral college. *Ray* v. *Blair*, 343 U.S. 213 (1951). A lower court in New York indicated by dictum that an elector could be compelled by mandamus to vote in accordance with his pledge. *Thomas* v. *Cohen*, 146 Misc. 836, 262 N.Y. Supp. 320 (Sup. Ct. 1933), but the courts of Alabama and Ohio have indicated to the contrary. Opinion of the Justices No. 87, 250 Ala. 399, 34 So. 2d 598 (1948); *State* v. *Hummel*, 150 Ohio St. 127, 80 N.E. 2d 899 (1948). In the latter case, the Ohio court stated:

"Ohio is entitled to 25 presidential electors to be elected at the 1948 general election. Each one of the 25 elected may vote as he pleases for any person eligible for the Office of President or Vice President of the United States. It is only by force of a moral obligation, not a legal one, that the presidential electors pledged to certain candidacies fulfill their pledges after election." 150 Ohio St. at 146, 80 N.E. 2d at 909.

[10] *McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1, 34 (1892).

votes to Cleveland's 168. We have had several "near-misses" where shifts of handfuls of popular votes in a few States would have produced a minority President.[11]

This feature of the present system probably draws the most fire and arouses the most emotional objections. Yet a poll which I conducted last year of heads of the Nation's political science departments showed only 34.2 percent in favor of direct election. How do we account for the relative unattractiveness to political scientists of this simple straightforward reform which would place presidential elections under the purest democratic principle? By eliminating the State as an electoral counting unit every vote would be equally reflected in the national totals. The minority party in a State would not see its votes counted out at the State level as is now done by the unit rule's operation. The swing votes of minority blocs in pivotal States would lose the special importance they now enjoy by virtue of their power to tip the electoral vote into one column or another in a close vote. The votes of any given group of Americans would look to a candidate like those of any other group.

Despite the objections to a minority President, there apparently is still a strong feeling that the Federal principle should not yet be abandoned in presidential elections. State and regional interests are still sufficiently important that sheer numbers of votes on a national level should not determine the Presidency. Disproportionate weighing of the votes of citizens of less populated States may become increasingly distasteful as the Supreme Court's decision on representation in State legislatures is implemented; [12] but for the time being the consensus is against a system which would ignore State lines and interests and cause campaigns to be directed to masses of voters.

A related objection is that direct election would necessarily nationalize our election machinery. Every voter would have an immediate interest in the fairness and accuracy of the election machinery in every State. Voters in Maine, for instance, could see their votes nullified by opposing votes in Alaska as readily as by votes cast in the same precinct in Maine. That this would require national election laws and Federal administration of elections is not denied by most advocates of direct national election.

A weaker argument is that direct election would result in a race among the States to lower voting qualifications as each State sought the greatest possible voice in selecting the President. Some suggest that ridiculous voting ages might result and that all States would be driven to the lowest common denominator of voting qualifications. This could be avoided by providing in any amendment that voting qualifications in each State shall be those requisite for electing the most numerous branch of the State legislature, as is the case now for congressional elections. In order to generate a larger popular vote in presidential elections, a State would then have to adopt the same broadened suffrage requirement for electing its State legislators, senators, and representatives.

The most frequent argument made against direct national election in the Congress is that it would be futile for Congress to submit such an amendment to the States; that it would have no chance of ratification by three-fourths of the States because 36 of them have added weight in the election of the President by reason of the electoral college system. This theoretical advantage of voters in smaller States is shown by the following table:

Ratio of electoral votes to population for 1964 and 1968 presidential elections (based on 1960 census)

Rank and State:	Ratio
1. Alaska	75,389
2. Nevada	95,093
3. Wyoming	110,022
4. Vermont	129,960
5. Delaware	148,764
6. New Hampshire	151,730
7. North Dakota	158,112
8. Hawaii	158,193
9. Idaho	166,798
10. Montana	168,692
11. South Dakota	170,129
12. Rhode Island	214,872
13. Utah	222,657
14. New Mexico	237,756
15. Maine	242,316
16. District of Columbia	254,652
17. Arizona	260,452
18. West Virginia	265,774
19. Nebraska	282,266
20. Oklahoma	291,036
21. Colorado	292,325
22. Oregon	294,781
23. Arkansas	297,712
24. South Carolina	297,824
25. Iowa	306,369
26. Maryland	310,069
27. Mississippi	311,163
28. Kansas	311,230
29. Connecticut	316,904
30. Washington	317,024
31. Tennessee	324,281
32. Louisiana	325,702
33. Alabama	326,674
34. Georgia	328,593
35. Wisconsin	329,315
36. Virginia	330,579
37. Kentucky	337,573
38. Minnesota	341,386
39. North Carolina	350,473
40. Florida	353,682
41. New Jersey	356,870
42. Indiana	358,654
43. Missouri	359,984
44. Massachusetts	359,984
45. Michigan	372,533
46. Ohio	373,325
47. Texas	383,187
48. Illinois	387,736
49. New York	390,286
50. Pennsylvania	390,323
51. California	392,930
National average	333,314

Yet can it truthfully be said that a voter in Alaska has five times the voice in electing the President as that of the voter in California or that a Nevadan has four times the voice of a New Yorker? The opposite is nearer the truth because New York equals 15 Nevadas where it really counts—in the electoral vote column as State units.

There were instances in our hearings where a witness would dismiss the practical chances of direct national election proposals as depriving the small States of their electoral vote advantage and then attack the present system as favoring the large States over the smaller ones.

The truth is that we have swung full circle and a system originally designed to favor the small States is now achieving the opposite result. This fact led former Presidents Truman and Hoover to sound similar notes in statements made for our hearings. President Truman described our problem as "the emergence of the big cities into political overbalance, with the threat of imposing their choices on the rest of the country." Mr. Hoover noted that our inquiry "confronts the same difficulties as were met by the Founding Fathers—that is, to prevent domination by a few large States."

If hope is ever abandoned for other reforms and we are faced with a choice between direct national election and the present system, this proposal might take on a different light. But for the present and the foreseeable future, I do not feel that direct national election is a serious possibility as a practical matter. It conflicts too greatly with our Federal principles and some deep-seated facts of political life.

THE DISTRICT SYSTEM

Both the district and proportional plans are aimed principally at the unit rule, the former by dividing electoral votes among districts within each State and the latter by proportioning electoral votes in each State in accordance with its popular vote.

Some form of the district system of choosing presidential electors was employed by a number of States in the early history of the Nation. It was favored in some form by such early statesmen as James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, Thomas Hart Benton, Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, and Daniel Webster. Madison wrote in 1823 that it "was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted." Four times between 1813 and 1824, constitutional amendments containing some form of the district system were approved by the Senate. In 1820, the House approved a district plan by a vote of 92 to 54. None has since been brought to a vote in either House.

Until the 87th Congress, recent proposals of the district system provided that two electors corresponding to Senators from each State would be elected at large and the balance (those corresponding to Representatives) would be chosen by congressional districts. This form of the district system became known as the Mundt-Coudert plan. The current version sponsored by Senator MUNDT differs in that it calls for independent presidential elector districts instead of using congressional districts.

Since the principal objective of the district system is to alleviate the consequences of the unit-rule or general-ticket system, it is relevant to consider the extent to which it will split State units of electoral votes. Historically, the district system had limited results in breaking up State unit votes. From 1789 to 1892, there were 52 instances of States using some form of district system. In 36 instances, the State's vote were still cast as a unit.[13] Analysis of how the district system would have operated in 1960 indicates that a surprisingly high number of States'

[11] In 1916 Woodrow Wilson won reelection with a nationwide popular plurality of more than 590,000 votes over Charles Evans Hughes. Yet Hughes would have been elected if he had carried California, a State which he lost by only 3,806 votes. In the election of 1884, Grover Cleveland had a 23,000 vote plurality over James G. Blaine. The election turned on the outcome in the State of New York, which Cleveland won by only 1,148 votes. In 1844, Polk defeated Clay by 170 electoral votes to 105 and by a popular vote margin of 38,000 votes. A switch of 3,000 votes in the State of New York would have changed the result and elected Clay. In 1948, a shift of 17,000 votes in Illinois, 3,500 votes in Ohio, and 9,000 votes in California would have transferred 78 electoral votes from Mr. Truman to Mr. Dewey, and the latter would have been elected despite the fact that his opponent had polled 2 million more popular votes.

[12] A hint to possible new sources of electoral college dissatisfaction is in the opinion of the three-judge Federal court which has held the Georgia county unit system unconstitutional. The New York Times quotes the court's opinion as going on to say that no new county unit system would be unconstitutionally discriminatory "* * * if the disparity against any county is not in excess of the disparity that exists against any State in the most recent electoral college allocation. * * *" New York Times, Apr. 29, 1962, sec. 1, p. 1, col. 6, at p. 54, col. 5. The table on p. 195 infra shows this disparity to be more than 5 to 1—1 electoral vote for 75,389 persons in Alaska against 1 vote for 392,930 persons in California.

[13] Hearings, supra note 2, at 508.

votes would have still been cast in bloc. If congressional districts had been used for a district plan in 1960, electoral votes would still have been cast in a bloc by these 21 States: Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming. These States had a total of 119 electoral votes. In an additional 7 States with a total of 51 electoral votes, only 1 vote in each would have been split from the State unit. They are Arkansas (1 of 8), Colorado (1 of 6), Connecticut (1 of 8), Idaho (1 of 4), Indiana (1 of 13), Montana (1 of 4), and Oklahoma (1 of 8). In 6 more States having a total of 75 electoral votes, the minority party would have captured no more than 25 percent of the electoral vote. They are Kentucky (2 of 10), Ohio (5 of 25), South Carolina (2 of 8), Virginia (3 of 12), West Virginia (2 of 8), and Wisconsin (3 of 12).[14]

This suggests that in many States, the division of political sentiment is sufficiently uniform throughout the States that voting by districts will produce the same result as voting by States. For the minority party to capture electoral votes, its strength must be localized in pockets large enough to carry districts. In many States (and all districts), minority party voters would still be "disfranchised" in the sense that their popular votes would not be reflected in the national vote totals.

In populous States with distinctive rural and urban areas, the district system very effectively splits State unit votes. Using the same analysis, in 1960 New York's vote would have split 25–20, California 19–13, Illinois 15–12, Pennsylvania 17–15, and Michigan 10–10.[15] The large States would be drastically affected while most small States and essential one-party States would see little change in the course of their electoral votes. One can see the truth to Thomas Hart Benton's 1834 prediction that "the district system would break the force of the large States."[16]

In still another way, the district system's impact would vary between large and small States. This is in weight of individual votes where the district system is claimed to correct disparities favoring large States. Under the unit-rule system each citizen has as many votes in presidential elections as his State has electors. A New Yorker voted in 1960 for all of his State's 45 electors, but the Nevadan only voted for 3. The district system is said to be an equalizer, limiting every person to voting for only three electors.

At first glance, this may appear valid but it ignores another vitally important factor—the number of voters sharing the choice in each instance. There is no equality if one set of three electors is elected by a group of 100,000 voters and three other electors are chosen by 1 million voters. When the citizen of New York voted for his 45 electors in 1960, he shared his choice with more than 7,200,000 other voters. In 1960, each electoral vote of New York corresponded to 162,018 popular votes, but in Nevada to only 35,756 voters. The district system would aggravate these State-to-State disparities. The one elector chosen corresponding to each voter's Representative in Congress will roughly represent the same number of persons in every State. But the disparity in voters per elector is widened greatly for the two at-large senatorial electors who represent two-thirds of each voter's participation. In 1960, more than 7,200,000 New York voters would have shared in selecting the at-large electors under a district system, as against approximately 60,000 voters in Alaska—a ratio of 120 to 1, worse than the extremes of Georgia's much publicized county unit system.

Instead of equalizing voter representation, the district system therefore introduces a new inequality of voting weight in favor of smaller States' citizens far greater than that now operating against them. This demonstrates the fallacy of attempting to apply concepts of voter equality while retaining the system of electorial votes which flows from Federal principles of State representation in our bicameral National Legislature.

Another problem raised by the district system is the vast decentralization which it would introduce into presidential elections. Assuming the membership of the House is not increased, there will be 435 separate and independent single-elector districts and each State continues to be a district for choosing two at-large electors. In the District of Columbia and five States having only one representative, there will be no districting because the single-elector district corresponds with the two-elector district. Each will be a three-elector district. Within the 45 States having more than one Representative there will be created 430 single-elector districts corresponding to the Representatives from these States. Thus, viewing a "district" as a distinct geographical area to which electoral votes are assigned as a unit, there will be 6 three-elector districts, 45 two-elector districts, and 430 single-elector districts, or a total of 481 separate presidential election districts. The 538 electoral votes which would otherwise be cast in 51 State units of from 3 to 43 votes will be scattered among 481 units of from 1 to 3 votes each. This fragmentation of a Federal election carries obvious implications in terms of targeting campaign appeals, reporting election returns, contesting State and district results, and speedy ascertainment of the national results.

More troublesome than the plethora of 481 electoral districts is the possibility of manipulation and political abuses of the 430 districts which will be established by State legislatures. Prior to the 87th Congress, proposals of the district system provided that electoral districts would be identical with congressional districts. If a State elected its Congressmen at large, it would also choose its presidential electors at large. If congressional districts were gerrymandered or malapportioned for the benefit of a particular party in power, their effects would have been carried over into the election of the President.[17]

In reintroducing this proposal in the 87th Congress, its principal sponsors admitted that the past proposal (the Mundt-Coudert plan) was vulnerable on this point. It was therefore modified to require that electoral districts be of "contiguous and compact territory" and contain "as nearly as practicable the number of persons entitling the State to one Representative in the Congress."[18]

This envisions either two State systems of Federal electoral districts, one for Congressmen and one for presidential electors, or that congressional districts will be reconstituted to meet these standards. There seems to be general agreement that although two sets of electoral districts are possible, they would not be desirable. Voters at the same polling place could be voting for the same Congressmen but for different district presidential electors, or vice versa. (Elimination of the elector could cure this but still the district presidential vote could be included in a different district's returns.)

Instead of either reforming congressional districts or establishing separate presidential districts, State legislatures would be tempted to adopt existing congressional districts as their presidential elector districts. Many of the same political pressures and chances for partisan advantage would operate in both instances. In fact, it is possible for either type of district to meet the tests of compactness, contiguity, and equality of population and still be drawn for political advantage. A common sort of example is the Kansas congressional redistricting after the 1960 census. The Republican State legislature split Democratic Kansas City between two rural strongly Republican districts. Neither party has a monopoly on this sort of thing but densely populated metropolitan areas are obviously more vulnerable to this divide-and-conquer partitioning.

The next question is whether the constitutional standards for presidential elector districts can be enforced as a practical matter. The Supreme Court's decision in the Tennessee apportionment case indicates that Federal courts will no longer avoid the "political thicket" of districting and apportionment. In any event, the constitutional amendment could include a clause requiring the courts to take jurisdiction and enforce districting standards. Nonetheless, the suitability and practicality of judicial action in this area still raises many questions. What would be the allowable deviation of norms of population? Would the courts establish proper districts or merely enjoin certification of election results from improper districts? Would the State's two at-large electoral votes be validly cast in all events? Presumably, a court could not order an at-large election because the Constitution would specifically require that electors be chosen by districts. How would the cumbersomeness and delay of appeals affect elections?

An alternative method for enforcing district standard might be the power of Congress in counting the electoral votes to reject votes certified from States whose districts did not conform to constitutional standards. If this happened, the State would have lost its voice in the particular presidential election. The political implications obviously would cause a hesitancy in Congress to exercise such power. The strict party lines upon which the 1876 Hayes-Tilden election was resolved in Congress is indicative of the extreme reluctance which a party in power would hold toward rejecting electoral votes cast for its candidate. Another historical lesson may lie in the fact that Congress never refused to seat Members elected from congressional districts which did not conform to Federal statutory requirements during the period from 1842 to 1929 when there was pertinent Federal legislation on the books. Some point also to the fact that Congress has never exercised its power under the 14th amendment to reduce a State's representation in Congress because of denial of voting rights.

Another possibility is simply to allow Congress to establish the districts or to give it a corrective power to modify districts established initially by the States. Once again is reared the ugly head of party politics. If our present system has any particular advantage, it is the certainty and inflexibility of 50 electoral districts. It is known from one election to the next just exactly what the system will be throughout the entire country. The complexities and uncertainties of the district system would be a considerable departure from this.

The conceptual basis of the district system raises an interesting question of political

[14] Id. at 411. (The first list obviously includes six States having only three electoral votes which would not be districted.)

[15] Ibid.

[16] Id. at 813.

[17] Disparities in population of congressional districts may account for how the 1960 election results would have been changed by this system. According to an analysis by the Congressional Quarterly, Feb. 13, 1961, a district system using congressional districts would have caused Nixon to defeat Kennedy by 33 electoral votes, 278 to 245. Hearings, supra note 2, at 411.

[18] S.J. Res. 12, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961).

theory. It is called the "counterpart system" by some because it would put the Presidency and the Congress on the same political base. People would vote in the same combinations and with the same relative weight for the Presidency as they do for their share of the total representation in Congress where each voter is represented by his State's two Senators and the Representative from his congressional district.

Many feel that this is desirable and that it would produce a President whose program and political beliefs are more likely to be in harmony with those of the Congress. After 23 years in Congress, I am inclined to doubt that there is any such "consensus" among 535 legislators which could or should be a yardstick for measuring the Presidency. A President who had to appeal separately to the myriad of conflicting State and district interests represented in Congress would be less likely to have the positive and dynamic program for action which is needed for that high office under the demands of the cold war and space age.

A strong argument can be made, too, that the Presidency and the Congress should not necessarily be responsive to exactly the same electorates. The separation of powers doctrine may require not only a division of powers between the separate branches, but also having them responsive to different electorates—that is, the people voting in different combinations. Having the President elected upon a different political base helps to insure that conflicting interests are all represented in the Federal Government and the interplay of the executive and legislative branches helps toward ultimate accommodation of the legitimate interests of all segments of our society. Along these general lines, James Madison wrote: [19]

"It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. Different interests necessarily exist in different classes of citizens. If a majority be united by a common interest, the rights of the minority will be insecured. There are but two methods of providing against this evil: The one, by creating a will in the community independent of the majority—that is, of the society itself; the other, by comprehending in the society so many separate descriptions of citizens as will render an unjust combination of a majority of the whole very improbable, if not impracticable. The second method will be exemplified in the Federal Republic of the United States. Whilst all authority in it will be derived from and dependent on the society, the society itself will be broken into so many parts, interests, and classes of citizens, that the right of individuals, or of the minority, will be in little danger from interested combinations of the majority."

Also, the concept underlying the election and functioning of Congress breaks down when one attempts to transfer it to the Presidency. Unlike electoral votes, Senators and Representatives cannot be equated to each other. The 435 Members of the House are coordinate with only 100 Senators. Yet no one suggests that the 100 electors corresponding to Senators should have a weight in the presidential election equal to that of the 435 electors corresponding to Representatives.

In another sense, the district system would not be a counterpart of congressional elections in the constitutional sense. The Constitution left the States free, subject to ultimate congressional regulation, to elect their Representatives either at large or by districts. The framers did not specify how either electors or Representatives would be chosen. The district system would make presidential elections a constitutional counterpart of an extra-constitutional method of electing Representatives. That the framers did not contemplate true counterparts is suggested by the fact that the Constitution protects each State from having its representation in the Senate taken away without its consent but makes no similar provision for the two presidential electors corresponding to Senators.

The truth is of course that the constitutional schemes for both presidential elections and congressional representation were necessary compromises between large and small States to secure ratification. They were hammered out as matters of necessity along similar lines by giving equal representation to States in the Senate and two bonus electors to each State in the poorly conceived electoral college, but here the similarity ceases. I think the demands upon and duties of the Presidency are so vastly different from those of Senators and Representatives that it serves no purpose to seek further common constitutional bases in their election. If the district system were a true counterpart, it would be more cause for criticism than for support.

THE PROPORTIONAL SYSTEM

Like the district system, this plan retains the States' electoral votes and seeks to eliminate the unit rule. Instead of using districts within States to split State units, it would divide every State's electoral votes among the candidates in proportion to their shares of its popular vote. Unlike the district system, it insures that the electoral votes of every State will be apportioned among the principal candidates, and it accomplishes this while still retaining the 50 States (and the District of Columbia) as the only separate electoral districts. This proposal is commonly called the Lodge-Gossett plan, for Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, and Representative Ed Gossett, of Texas, who were its principal sponsors when it was approved by the Senate in 1950 by a vote of 65 to 27. Electors are eliminated and each State's electoral votes are divided to the nearest one-thousandth in the same proportion as the total popular vote of the State. Forty percent of the total number of electoral votes is necessary for election. In the event no candidate receives 40 percent, election is by the House and Senate in joint assembly with each Member having one vote and a majority of the votes being necessary for election.

If I appear to have some slight prejudice in favor of this approach, it is because I have supported it for a number of years, both in the House and Senate. It seems to me to be the reform which best meets the principal evils of the present system while introducing a minimum of new complications or inequities. The idea is not of recent vintage, although not so old as the district system, having first been proposed as a constitutional amendment by Representative Lawrence, of New York, in 1848. In the 1870's Representative Ashley, of Ohio, even advanced a proportional plan which retained the individual presidential electors.[20]

In 1896, the classic essay of Dr. Herman V. Ames analyzed all proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States during the first century of its history. Of those concerning presidential elections, he concluded that [21] "the proposition for the distribution of the electoral vote of each State among the candidates in the proportion the electoral ratio shall bear to the popular vote of each candidate seems the fairest and most desirable of all the plans presented, as it retains the relative importance of each State, and at the same time secures to the minority its due proportion of the vote."

When the Senate approved the Lodge-Gossett plan by the lopsided 65 to 27 vote in 1950, it was the first breakthrough for electoral reform in either house in 125 years. But the groundwork in the House had been poorly done. It was only considered under a motion to suspend the rules for its consideration and this was soundly defeated by a vote of 210 to 134.

The proportional plan bounced back in 1955 when the Senate Judiciary Committee again reported it favorably. Before it was considered on the floor of the Senate, a compromise was reached to secure the support of those who favored the district plan and a substitute amendment was offered by the principal sponsors under which each State would be given the option of using the proportional system or the district system. The substitute amendment was only agreed to by a vote of 48 to 37. This made it apparent that the requisite two-thirds approval could not be obtained and the principal sponsors moved to recommit the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary. (This "neither fish nor fowl" hybrid proved more vulnerable in debate than either plan separately and it has not been seriously considered since. It has not even been reintroduced as an original resolution in the Senate.)

The proportional plan proved to be the most popular in the poll of political scientists which I mentioned earlier, drawing approval from 46.9 percent as against only 16.2 percent for the district system. Unless it has lost its steam from past reversals, it would still seem to be the most likely possibility for substantial reform. What are the objections to it?

The criticism most often made of the proportional system is that it would encourage splinter parties and endanger our two-party system. A splinter party could reflect its popular votes in the electoral college by polling small percentages of the popular vote within a State and could obtain roughly the same proportion of the national electoral votes as it obtains of the total popular vote.

Neither the assertion nor denial of this charge is susceptible of much proof or documentation. But the American voter characteristically wants a chance of voting with the winner. Whether his vote is counted out at the State or district level by a unit rule, or at the national level where it is insufficient by virtue of its total, he is not likely to waste his vote on a third-party candidate who has no chance of winning.

The requirement of only a 40 percent plurality of the electoral votes for election is also a deterrent to third-party movements. A third party could not expect to throw the election into Congress with less than 20 percent of the total electoral vote. If an election is ever thrown into the Congress, the choice there is limited to the top two candidates (as against three under present constitutional provisions), which will prevent a third-party candidate from being considered or holding the balance of power there.

Some criticize the 40-percent provision and call it a departure from traditional majority rule concepts and an implicit admis-

[19] The Federalist No. 51, at 325–326 (Lodge ed. 1888) (Madison).

[20] The voters were to vote directly for President and Vice President and the legislature was then to appoint the electors, taking care to secure to each candidate voted for in the State an equitable representation in the electoral college, as indicated by the number of votes returned for each candidate. Hearings, supra note 2, at 816.

[21] Id. at 804. This prize essay, "Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States During the First Century of Its History," was first published in 2 American Historical Association, Annual Report for the year 1896 (1897); see id. at 113.

sion that candidates would be less likely to capture electoral majorities under the proportional system. But any elective system must provide in some way for an ultimate final choice, and any provision of this sort is at best a compromise. Election by the 535 individual Members of Congress is generally regarded as the best contingent method but this is to be avoided if reasonable alternatives are available. I believe I speak for many Members when I say that it is a function we would not relish. The 40-percent provision should cause elections in Congress to be very, very rare. Election of a candidate who has such a plurality is preferable to election by the Congress. This provision has much to commend it for any proposal.

The proportional system is often met by critics' cries of "proportional representation," or "P.R.," a system of representation which allows minority parties to elect delegates to parliamentary bodies. This term would certainly apply to the proportional plan if the electoral college were a deliberative body and individual electors were divided proportionally among al parties which polled popular votes. Any representation concept becomes irrelevant when the college of individual electors is eliminated. Electoral votes are retained only as a counting device for the Federal purpose of weighting voting strengths among the various States. The object is to choose one Chief Executive for the Nation, and as Senator Lodge stated in 1950: "Even the cleverest surgeon cannot divide one man up—proportionally or otherwise—and expect him to live." If this system involves proportional representation, then so do 99 percent of our elections in America because it only provides for counting all votes cast. Direct national election would do the same thing. Once it is recognized that "representation" is not involved and that "proportioning" is done so that our electoral counting device accurately projects the popular will of each State, then the proportional representation argument vanishes.

Indeed, dividing electoral votes to reflect the popular votes could minimize, rather than encourage, the influence of multiple parties and pressure factions. Small groups in large pivotal States now hold positions of great importance because they may add or withhold enough votes from either party to swing the State's entire block of electoral votes. Examples include the Liberal party in New York and the candidacy of Henry Wallace in 1948, which is considered to have thrown two States to Mr. Dewey.

The district system may be equally or more vulnerable in this respect by its localizing effects. For instance, a Farm Party in agricultural sections, or a Labor party in industrialized areas might capture enough single-elector districts to gain a balance of power position in the electoral vote.

In the 1956 Senate debates and again in our 1961 hearings, it was argued that the proportional system would penalize two-party States and favor the so-called one-party States. One witness cited as an example that under the unit rule system, Mr. Kennedy won the States of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania in 1960 by a combined margin of 613,000 votes. He won Georgia and Louisiana by a combined margin of 360,000 votes. If the proportional plan had been in effect, he would have gained a margin of 3.835 electoral votes in the larger group of States and a margin of 5.196 in the latter two States. In other words, a popular margin of 613,000 in closely contested States would have netted less than three-quarters as much electoral vote advantage as a popular margin of only 360,000 in one-party States.[22]

This analysis is directed only to the net advantage in each group of States. Under the porportional system, Kennedy would have captured a total of 52,267 electoral votes from the first group of States but only 12.546 electoral votes from the latter.[23] Under any system, a candidate must obtain a majority (or at least 40 percent) of the entire electoral vote of the Nation and will seek an aggregate of electoral votes as well as aggregates of advantages. Kennedy's votes in the first four States would still have contributed four times as much to his election as the votes of the latter two States.

Let us look at how important New York would still continue to be as a State. Under the proportional plan, Mr. Kennedy would have received 23.638 of New York's 45 electoral votes in 1960, more than his combined share of the total electoral votes of Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, where he would have won 22.911 of 42 electoral votes. Under the porportional plan, one-half of New York's electoral votes is still greater than the combined electoral votes of seven States and would be 11 percent of the total necessary for election.[24]

Where the district system fragments New York's electoral vote into 45 pieces, the proportional system still allows each New Yorker's ballot to count toward the State's entire block of electoral votes—but only in proportion to relative party strengths within the State. By contrast to the unit-rule system, each party's weight in the national totals would only be in accordance with the relative weights in the State popular vote. Since this same principle would apply to all States, New York would have the relative voice to which its electoral vote entitles it, but no more.

A similar argument has caused many Republicans to look upon the proportional plan with disfavor. It has been shown that in most past elections Democratic candidates would have profited from the proportional system because of the so-called Solid South.[25] Democratic candidates would have given up fewer electoral votes by proportional division in Southern States then they would have gained by proportioning the more closely contested Northern and Western States.[26]

This objection is fast losing its validity. In the last four elections, there are only six States which have not gone Republican at least once[27] and nine States have gone Republican every time.[28] Having seen Tennessee go Republican in 1952, 1956, and 1960, I am painfully aware that in presidential elections the two-party system seems to have arrived in the South. The Midwest is beginning to appear more solidly Republican than the South is Democratic. In any event, an argument based upon shifting patterns of sectional party strength should not control in evaluating the soundness of a constitutional system to be used over a long period.[29]

Another objection often raised is that this plan would encourage disputed elections. In one sense, this is true. Any contest in any State which appreciably varied its popular vote totals would also vary the State and national electoral vote totals. Those seeking to change the apparent results of a close election would look anywhere in the country for a potential election contest. This would also be true under direct national election and shows that the proportional plan is a substantial movement in this direction. The district system's proliferation of election jurisdictions correspondingly increases the potential for contests but, like the proportional system, it reduces the effects of local irregularities.

The temptation to cry or commit fraud and to challenge election results will be much less when the shift of a handful of votes in a State can no longer tip inordinately great blocks of electoral votes from one column to another. Under the proportional system, the effect of accident or fraud in the electoral vote column would be only in proportion to its effect on the popular vote. Only in an extremely close election on the national scale would it be worth the trouble to contest local results. As 1960 demonstrated, such an election will always bring uncertainty in determining the final results.

The mathematics involved in computing each State's electoral vote to the nearest one-thousandth also troubles some observers. But when it is considered that 100 popular votes may be represented by one-thousandth of an electoral vote, this becomes a positive advantage. Again it illustrates that, except for retaining the electoral vote weighing of States votes, the proportional system amounts to direct election.

Both the district and proportional systems would alleviate the great emphasis now placed upon the large pivotal States and relatively small organized groups of "swing voters" who may hold the balance of power in such States. The district system largely isolates voters' influence to the districts where they live and the proportional system limits their voice to its proportionate numerical weight. Under either system, campaigns would be directed more to the country as a whole. Citizens of smaller States are now less apt to see the candidates in person and they understandably may feel that their interests are of lesser importance to their President. Except for Alf Landon, of Kansas, in 1936 and the incumbent President Truman, of Missouri, in 1948, both major parties

---

[22] Statement submitted by Gus Tyler, director, political department, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, in hearings, supra note 2, at 672.

[23] Id., at 411.

[24] Ibid.

[25] See speech by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS on Senate floor, Mar. 26, 1956, in hearings, supra, note 2, at 744–776, and statement of Prof. Ruth C. Silva, in hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Nomination and Election of President and Vice President, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 334 (1955).

[26] The most frequently cited example is the election of 1900, when William McKinley had a total popular vote of 7,219,000 or 52.8 percent, and William Jennings Bryan had a popular vote of 6,358,000 or 47.2 percent. McKinley won with 292 electoral votes to Bryan's 155. If the proportional system had been used, with the same popular vote figures, Bryan would have had 218 electoral votes and McKinley 214. Yet Bryan had carried only 17 States, 11 of them in the South, 2 border States, and 4 Western States, while McKinley had carried 28 States, including all the Eastern, Middle Western, and Pacific Coast States, 3 border States, and 2 Western States. In other words, under the proportional system, McKinley would have lost many more electoral votes outside the South because of Democratic minority votes than he would have gained by virtue of Republican minority votes in solid Democratic States.

[27] Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. (Four of these went to the States' Rights candidates rather than Democratic in 1948.)

[28] Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, and Vermont.

[29] Although I think it can be highly misleading to rely upon hypothetical studies of past elections, the 1960 figures should be considered against those which have been used to argue that the proportional plan favors Democrats. The Congressional Quarterly's compilation of the 1960 results shows that Nixon would have won by less than one-half of one electoral vote under the proportional system. Hearings, supra note 2, at 411. (This requires a division of the Alabama Democratic vote 5–11 to Kennedy and 6–11 to unpledged, which gives Nixon a 1.750 electoral vote margin in Alabama.)

have limited their presidential nominations in the last half century to men from the eight largest States. Able men from small States now have little chance to secure nominations from either major party and are seldom even regarded as presidential timber.

Elimination of the unit rule by either the district or proportional system would thus go far toward truly nationalizing our presidential elections by restoring some balance to the roles of citizens in different sections of the country. The proportional system, however, would be less apt to swing the pendulum too far. The electoral votes of a large State would still be sought as a unit even they they are to be apportioned later in the counting process. The district system would partition large States voters into small units and leave only two electors as the target of statewide efforts. Considering the small fraction which the two at-large electors account for in most States electoral votes, it is safe to say that the State as such would become insignificant as an election unit. Real damage to our Federal principles could result if parties and candidates become unconcerned with State interests. Continuing the State unit system to the extent the proportional system does is not only a fair price to pay for keeping the electoral vote advantage of small States, but is also good insurance that presidential elections will retain a sound balance between local, State, and National interests.

ELIMINATION OF ELECTORS

Doing away with the troublesome institution of individual presidential electors is a procedural reform which could be accomplished with or without other substantial reform and without touching the balance of political power in the country. One may well wonder why this was not done long ago apart from other controversies about the system.

This idea is almost as old as the electoral college itself. As soon as the rise of the two-party system and popular democracy caused electors to become mere "dummies," proposed amendments in the Congress began to include or center upon provisions for abolition of the office of elector. A Senate committee headed by Senator Thomas Hart Benton in 1826 recommended a form of the district system under which people would vote directly for President without the intervention of electors. Its report stated: [30]

"In the first election held under the Constitution, the people looked beyond these agents, fixed upon their candidates for President and Vice President, and took pledges from the electoral candidates to obey their will. In every subsequent election the same thing has been done. Electors, therefore, have not answered the design of their institution. They are not the independent body and superior characters which they were intended to be. They are not left to the exercise of their own judgment; on the contrary, they give their vote, or bind themselves to give it, according to the will of their constituents. They have degenerated into mere agents, in a case which requires no agency, and where the agents must be useless, if he is faithful, and dangerous if he is not."

Also in 1826, Representatives Haynes, of Georgia, was introducing the first proposed amendment to abolish electors and automatically award a State's entire electoral vote to the winner of its popular vote. At the same time, the legislators of Georgia, Alabama, and Missouri concurred in resolutions proposing amendments along the same line.

President Andrew Jackson, in his first annual message to Congress, urged that the people within the States should vote directly for the President, warning that "in proportion as agents to execute the will of the people are multiplied, there is danger of their wishes being frustrated. Some may be unfaithful, all are liable to err." [31] Andrew Johnson, as Representative, Senator, and President, advocated direct election by districts without electors, as did Senator Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, the leading advocate of electoral reform in the 1870's. In 1934 an amendment abolishing electors sponsored by Senator Norris, of Nebraska, passed the Senate 52 to 29, just short of the required two-thirds approval.

Concern with the constitutional independence of electors is considered trivial by some. From 1789 to 1960, in no more than 8 instances of a possible 14,000 can it be said that individual electors departed from their mandates, and none of these affected the result of an election. However, three of these eight instances have occurred since 1948, and there is current evidence of substantial efforts to control election results by exploiting the elector's constitutional independence.

A 1948 Tennessee elector who was on both the Democratic and States' Rights tickets was elected as a result of popular votes cast for the Democratic ticket. Nevertheless, he voted in the electoral college for the States' Rights candidate. Although he had indicated his intentions before he was elected, his presence on the Democratic ticket of electors made it impossible for the voters of Tennessee to register the State's entire vote for the Democratic nominee. In 1956, one Alabama Democratic elector voted for a person other than the Democratic nominee. In 1960, Mr. Henry D. Irwin, a Republican elector from the State of Oklahoma, cast his vote for Senator HARRY F. BYRD instead of Mr. Richard Nixon.

On July 13, 1961, Mr. Irwin testified before our Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments concerning his actions.[32] Without opposition in the Republican primary, he had been 1 of 11 electors nominated by the Oklahoma Republican Party. In order to qualify for the primary, he had been required to file a sworn written statement that he believed in the principles of the Republican Party and intended to vote for its nominees at the coming general election. (Since the electors, and not Nixon and Lodge, were the nominees of the Republican Party in the general election, Mr. Irwin technically carried out this pledge by voting for himself and the other Republican nominees for elector.) Mr. Irwin testified that he never intended to vote for Nixon if he were the nominee.[33]

When the Republican ticket carried Oklahoma by over 160,000 votes, Mr. Irwin was elected to the exalted constitutional office of "elector of the President and Vice President." Irwin then helped spearhead an almost unbelievable coalition movement between the general election and the meeting of the college of electors on December 19. It sought to combine Republican electors who would otherwise have cast useless votes for the defeated Mr. Nixon with enough unpledged and defecting Southern Democratic electors to elect some third candidate in the electoral college.

Mr. R. Lea Harris, an attorney of Montgomery, Ala., conceived the idea and wrote to all presidential electors on November 9 of plans for such a coalition. Irwin was attracted to Harris' idea and agreed to solicit all Republican electors for the plan. Irwin wired every elected Republican elector in the country urging them to join the coalition and vote for a third ticket. He received approximately 40 responses from Republican electors. The great majority indicated a feeling of legal or moral obligation to vote for Nixon. About 13 indicated interest in the coalition plan and a desire to participate if it had any chance of success. Three were interested if they were released from pledges by official party organizations.

Irwin then decided that the principal obstacle to the coalition was the false assumption by electors that they were obligated to vote for Nixon. He then wired each Republican national committeeman and each State Republican chairman and urged them to release the Republican electors from any feeling of moral obligation to vote for Nixon so they could join the coalition. He received six responses, three of which were sympathetic but none offering assistance. The high point of Irwin's effort was the New Mexico committeeman's response that he had taken up the matter with party leaders at the Republican National Committee level, and that although they favored the move, they felt is should not be sponsored by the party organization.[34]

Irwin and Harris bombarded electors with literature urging them to cast "free votes" as their constitutional right and duty, but on December 19, all Republican electors except Irwin himself stood firm and voted for Nixon. Along with the 14 unpledged electors of Alabama and Mississippi, Irwin voted for Senator BYRD.

Harris and Irwin concluded that his vote had served to educate people to the freedom of electors and immediately started working toward 1964. In a post-mortem form letter of December 30, 1960, Harris laid out plans for a similar effort for 1964 and urged friends of the movement to begin now to arrange to become presidential electors.[35]

As a result of Irwin's actions, Oklahoma election laws were amended in 1961 to provide that electors shall be chosen by State party conventions, that each must sign an affidavit that he will vote for the party nominees, and that violation of the oath is a misdemeanor punishable by $1,000 fine.[36] The fine is the only means of enforcing the oath. If an elector is willing to incur the fine or wishes to contest the constitutionality of the law, he could still vote for someone else and his vote would be so recorded. Mr. Irwin testified that the prospect of such a fine would not have deterred him if there had been such a law in Oklahoma in 1960.

In the emotionally charged climate of Presidential elections, circumstances are not at all inconceivable where enough electors might follow Irwin's example to change the result of an election. Considering the excess-baggage nature of the elector, why should any risk be taken that a few individuals could someday miscarry an election when they have long since ceased to serve their intended purpose and are at best an imperfect conduit?

It is too bad the elector cannot be eliminated by a constitutional amendment which said nothing more, but this is not possible. Any amendment which eliminates the elector but retains the States' electoral votes must include some means for translating popular vote pluralities into electoral votes.

The minimal amendment would seem to be one which provides that the State's electoral vote will be automatically awarded to the winner of its popular vote as has been the virtually uniform practice for 135 years. In much the same manner as electors' votes are now certified to the Congress, the vote of the people for the candidates could be certified directly. Ample time could still be allowed for resolving election contests at the State level before certification of results. In fact, more time could be allowed and the possibility of resolving disputes in

[30] Senate select committee, resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, S. Rept. No. 22, 19th Cong., 1st sess. 4 (1826).

[31] Message to Congress, Dec. 8, 1829, in "Andrew Jackson, Annual Messages," 10 (Coale & Co., 2d ed. 1835).

[32] Hearings, supra note 2, at 562–655

[33] Id., at 598–599.

[34] Id. at 617.

[35] Id. at 607.

[36] Oklahoma Statute, ch. 28, secs. 519–522 (1961).

the Congress could be reduced because of the elimination of the intermediate step of electors meeting and voting.

This straightforward proposal meets opposition from two sources. One school of thought resists incorporating the unit-rule system in the Constitution. They feel that this might freeze this system for a number of years and harm the chances for more substantial reform. I doubt this. The public's view of such an amendment would be that it was directed simply at the office of presidential elector and not at any broader problem. In any event, this improvement is sufficiently worthwhile of itself to justify the slight risk of hampering further reform.

A second source of opposition is the few who believe the presidential elector to be a worthwhile office which ought to be retained. These are not merely the tiny number of extremists who want the elector to exercise his independent judgment and choose the President. Some few believe the elector is essential to preserving State control of decentralization of presidential elections.[37]

I have considered this argument carefully but cannot agree. Just as State law and the two-party system are now trusted to produce elections of presidential electors, they can also be trusted to produce elections of presidential candidates. A corrective amendment of the type I have mentioned would simply guarantee to the people of each State the right to vote directly for the President, just as they now do for Congressmen and Senators. Voting qualifications for presidential elections could also be left expressly to State control as could regulation of the times, places, and manner of elections. The nominating process is now extra-constitutional and would continue to be so. Just as State law now determines how electors get on the ballot, State law could as easily prescribe how the names of presidential candidates get on the ballot. In 33 States which have so-called short ballots, it is the names of presidential candidates, not the electors, that now appear on the ballot.

If he functions as expected, the elector is only a conduit through which the popular will is conducted and a more reliable conduit is readily available. The popular vote of each State can be transformed directly into the electoral vote counting process. We now have four steps: (1) The people elect electors in November; (2) the electors meet and elect the President in December; (3) the States certify the electors' votes to Congress; and (4) the Congress counts and certifies the final result in January. This proposal simply eliminates the second step and requires the States to certify their popular vote totals to Congress where it is simple arithmetic to count the electoral votes accordingly. Legally and constitutionally, we do not have a President-elect until December. If the electors were eliminated, we would have a President-elect in November.

Should the elector be retained for the possible exercise of his constitutional discretion in this interim? There is no conceivable situation where the elector might exercise his discretion which could not be handled better in some other way. If the successful candidate dies between the November election and December electoral college meeting, party regulations and State law now provide methods which direct the elector how to vote. Once the electors meet and vote, we now have the same situation until Congress convenes as we would have without electors from the popular election until Congress meets. No new problem or vacuum would be created.

Elimination of electors would also eliminate the use of unpledged electors as occurred in two States in 1960. In a sense, this was a return to the system contemplated by Hamilton and the Founding Fathers; but almost everyone today believes that the American people should elect their President. More important, unpledged electors should be precluded because of their potential for manipulation and balance-of-power bargaining in a close election.

An amendment which abolished electors could also improve the present provision for contingent elections in the House of Representatives. If the electoral vote fails to produce a majority for any candidate, the Constitution now places the election in the House of Representatives with the delegation of each State having one vote. In 1800 and 1824 our Presidents were elected in this manner. Since each State's vote is determined by the majority of its delegation, if a delegation is evenly split, the State would lose its vote. It is also unfair to give a one-member State delegation [38] the same voice as the 41 member delegation of New York. The opportunity for deadlock and third party balance of power is also apparent. Most proposed amendments would correct this inequity by substituting election by a joint session of the House and Senate with each Member having one vote. This would give each State the same relative weight that it has in the electoral vote.

Indications are that the House would not object to sharing this responsibility with the Senate. In fact, after the Adams-Jackson-Crawford deadlock of 1824,[39] the House adopted a resolution urging that some provision be made so that election of the President could never again devolve upon the Congress.

An amendment aimed at electors and contingent elections which accepted the unit rule would at least perfect the present system as it is generally expected to function. It would provide a certain and uniform system which could not be manipulated from State to State or from election to election. In urging such an amendment, one scholar calls it a "housekeeping amendment." [40] This approach was supported by President Kennedy as a Senator [41] and by the Department of Justice in our 1961 hearings.[42] It has also been endorsed by an influential bar association.[43] This amendment would at least put our present electoral house in order while we continue the debate of whether to rebuild its basic structure.

CONCLUSION

I would not attempt to predict which of the possible reforms may become law or when this may occur. It has been 158 years since the constitutional method of electing the President was touched in any respect and it would be most presumptuous to make specific claims for the future. However, I do believe the climate for electoral reform is improving perceptively and that some of the most serious past obstacles are being removed.

Division among proponents of reform should lessen as a result of the current consideration of the subject by the public and in the Congress.[44] There will probably be lessened efforts for proposals which are shown to have no chance of success and their supporters will then be faced with a choice between the status quo and some other proposal. Through a process of narrowing the alternatives one of the basic proposed reforms should emerge as the only realistic alternative to the present system. What are now four or five opposing camps will become but two. When this occurs, but not before, I believe we can expect something substantial to be done.

[37] American Good Government Society, "How Should the President Be Elected?" 12 (1961).

[38] Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming each have one representative.

[39] Henry Clay was third in the popular vote but had fewer electoral votes than Crawford. Since the choice in the House was limited to the top three, Clay was not included.

[40] Burns, "A New Course for the Electoral College," New York Times, Dec. 18, 1960 (magazine), p. 10, cols. 1–4.

[41] S.J. Res. 132, 85th Cong., 1st sess. (1957).

[42] See testimony of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Assistant Attorney General, in hearings, supra note 2, at 371.

[43] Resolution of the Bar Association of the City of New York, Jan. 16, 1962.

[44] After this article was written, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, by a 4 to 2 vote, favorably reported S.J. Res. 12 (the district system) with amendments to the full Judiciary Committee on May 21, 1962. The subcommittee amendments would require pledges of electors and invalidate electoral votes cast in violation of such pledges.

PERSECUTION OF BAHAI

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep concern about the sentences of death and life imprisonment passed by a regional court in Morocco upon members of the Bahai faith because of their religious beliefs. On December 14, in the little Mediterranean town of Nadar, a tribunal sentenced 3 Bahais to death and 11 to long prison terms on charges of rebellion, disorders, threat to public security, formation of criminal association, and endangering religious faith. However, from all reports, the verdict is based on the fact that although nationals of an Islamic state, the accused are members of another faith.

Bahaism is a religion founded in the 19th century in Persia where its followers suffered persecution and martyrdom for many years. Gradually small communities with nearly 10,000 local centers have been set up in 257 countries, islands, and dependencies including the United States. Proclaiming the oneness of all of the great world religions, the Bahai faith accepts all their major prophets as equally inspired. It believes in the unity of all mankind and uses parts of the liturgy and ceremonies of Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, and other religions. According to Bahai law, followers must be loyal to the governments of the countries where they live.

Mr. President, the harshness of these sentences passed on the members of this faith has aroused heated controversy in Morocco and attracted the attention of the international press. This widespread reaction to the trial has forced the Secretary of Information to issue a statement assuring the public that the verdict is "not definitive" and that the condemned men have the right to appeal. The Supreme Court of Appeal in Rabat is to reexamine the case.

Mr. President, it is most ironic that during the same month in which this trial of Nadar was held, the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted two resolutions, one calling for an international convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance and the other reiterates the Assembly's "condemnation of all manifestations of racial prejudice and of national and religious intolerance." In addition, this resolution calls upon all governments to take steps to eradicate such intolerance. The Moroccan delegate

voted for these resolutions. Furthermore, it is most significant that the new Constitution of Morocco guarantees religious freedom. How far religious freedom under the Moroccan Constitution really applies, will be revealed in the coming weeks when the appeal before the supreme court is decided.

Mr. President, I have already been in touch with the State Department about this matter. In my judgment, the U.S. Government should make its views known, whether American citizens are involved or not, as to the importance of religious tolerance and self-restraint throughout the world. I am hopeful that private representations will be made by our Government and that a public discussion of the problem will take place in the United Nations. An enlightened world opinion can play an important role in encouraging fair treatment and respect for individual rights whenever and wherever instances of this kind arise.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN A WISE AND COURAGEOUS JURIST

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on February 12, Chief Justice Earl Warren addressed the Georgia Institute of Technology. An excellent editorial reviewing the occasion appeared in the Washington Post on February 15, and I invite the attention of my colleagues to it.

In a forthright and brilliant address, the Chief Justice contended that the law has lagged behind science. In support of his thesis that the law must grow, he said:

> Fortunately for us, the Founding Fathers painted with a broad brush. They wrote what they intended to be a living document, not one committed merely to the conditions of that day but one that could function under constantly changing conditions.

The Chief Justice's remarks are those of a man of great courage, wisdom, and depth. I congratulate him.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

DIPLOMATIC CHIEF JUSTICE

Chief Justice Warren proved himself a shrewd diplomat as well as a courageous jurist when he addressed the Georgia Institute of Technology the other day. Because of the general hostility of the South to his opinions in the school desegregation cases, his Atlanta speech was scanned with special care to see whether he would touch upon controversial civil rights.

Although the Chief Justice himself was given an ovation, "Impeach Earl Warren" signs were posted around the city and the delicacy of the occasion was generally recognized. In these circumstances the Chief Justice merits a high mark for his avoidance of any offense and at the same time his adroit refutation of the basic premise on which the southern extremists have built their case.

The Chief Justice talked largely about science. It was Georgia Tech's 75th anniversary. His emphasis on the achievements of science and technology won the sympathy and approval of his listeners. Scientists were given credit for leading the advance of civilization. "It would be foolhardy and impossible," the Chief Justice said, "to declare a moratorium on science as was proposed in the 1930's to cure the problems we then faced. Man must go on to ever-increasing knowledge and action in all fields. He wants to know more about the universe, about himself, and about life. He wants scientific knowledge to be used for the advancement of civilization rather than for its destruction."

Having made an unassailable case for the continued growth of science, the Chief Justice lamented that his own profession—law—has not kept pace. Further progress in science demands a "peaceful setting in both domestic and world law. A world without law is hell-bent for destruction with or without scientific discoveries." By this logical route the Chief Justice arrived at the conclusion that the law too must grow:

"It would be equally foolhardy and likewise impossible to declare a moratorium on emerging jurisprudence, as it struggles to meet the challenges of our time, which are so different from those of even our immediate ancestors, and even of our youth. Fortunately for us, the Founding Fathers painted with a broad brush. They wrote what they intended to be a living document, not one committed merely to the conditions of that day but one that could function under constantly changing conditions—even those we have today and those we will have in the generations to come."

In thus asserting that change in the law of life and that it must apply to government as well as science and that the Constitution makes allowance for growth of the law, the Chief Justice was undercutting the basic premise of his most extreme critics—that the Constitution means only what the Founding Fathers intended it to mean at the time it was written. But he did it so adroitly and so persuasively that none could have taken offense, many applauded and some extremists within and without his audience may have been shaken in their blind adherence to an untenable view.

INVESTIGATION OF SOVIET MILITARY BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, an arm of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has announced a much needed investigation into the Soviet military buildup in Cuba. This investigation, I am glad to say, will be under the direction of the able Senator from Mississippi, Senator JOHN STENNIS.

Under his leadership and direction, the country is assured that the hearings will develop all the available facts and will contribute greatly toward the formation of a firm national policy which will protect our national security.

Senator STENNIS has had many difficult assignments in the Senate and he has handled them with thoroughness, diligence, success, and great and lasting benefit to the Nation. It is fortunate that we have a man of his caliber to serve as chairman of such an important and far-reaching inquiry.

Several days ago, I had the pleasure of reading the article "The Passing Scene," by William S. White, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 4, 1963. I commend its reading to every Senator and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PASSING SCENE

(By William S. White)

INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF CUBA THREAT

An inquiry of enormous implications into the exact present military position in Castro Cuba is about to be opened by the Senate through one of its elite bodies. This is the Preparedness Subcommittee headed by Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi.

There are Senate investigations and there are Senate investigations. Some are disruptive headline safaris, inflaming public feeling and smearing honest people on the basis of "verdict first—evidence later." Some are of the finest quality: careful, fair, searching, pitiless but not petty, vigorous but not virulent.

Almost certainly, on the group's record, the investigation into Cuba to be made shortly by STENNIS' Preparedness Subcommittee will be one of these latter, a service to the highest interests of the United States and of this hemisphere.

What Senator STENNIS is interested in is to determine in behalf of the Senate, from our own military and intelligence sources and from responsible Cubans, precisely what Soviet armament remains in Cuba and precisely what capacity it may have to endanger this country or any other in the hemisphere.

No second guess

There is no purpose either to haze President Kennedy or to protect President Kennedy. There is also no purpose to second guess either the President's lack of support for the doomed patriots' invasion of Castro Cuba in the spring of 1961 or the President's strong action against the Soviet missile lodgment in Cuba in the fall of 1962.

What STENNIS and his colleagues—one of the best sets of men in the Senate and the most unpartisan when it comes to national security—most want to know is where we go from here. They are not too interested in who did what to whom in the lost yesterdays.

If they can sustain this Spartan course of sheer factfinding they will have given the whole Nation—not excluding President Kennedy himself—fresh reason to be glad that a Senate Preparedness Subcommittee exists.

For the problem as to Cuba is two sided. It is vital to have a public audit independent of that of the administration as to Castro's present offensive capabilities. But it is no less vital not to let some partisan motivated and incompetent Senate group rush into this sensitive area and trample all over the constitutional right of any President to run the foreign policy of the United States, right or wrong though his decisions may be thought to be.

Given inaction by STENNIS, just such a result probably would have followed. Given the readiness of the Stennis group to act, however, the strong probability is that because of its demonstrated competence and responsibility and restraint all hands will be satisfied to leave the matter in its hands.

A fateful verdict

And at the end, the country will have reason to rely on the findings of these good and able men—plus one woman: Senators STENNIS, STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, and E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, all Democrats, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, MARGARET SMITH, of Maine, and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, all Republicans.

If they find that Cuba in fact still poses an offensive threat to this country or hemi-

sphere, they will simply say so. If they find that Cuba in fact is no such offensive menace they will simply say so.

Thus, the verdict may be nothing less than fateful. If the verdict is that Cuba is still a seat of mortal peril to this hemisphere it will surely follow that Cuba in due time will be invaded and sanitized—not necessarily by the United States itself, but invaded and sanitized all the same. If the verdict is that Cuba is only a defensive lodgment of communism, the present slow course of trying to isolate and cut down Cuba by measures short of war will continue.

PLIGHT OF SEASONAL FARMWORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most courageous leaders in the fight for a better life for one of America's most underprivileged groups, our seasonal farmworkers, has been the archbishop of San Antonio, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey. As executive chairman of the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking, he has long shown a deep concern for the migrant farmworkers, so many of whom are Spanish-speaking Americans. Recently his efforts and achievements received the recognition they most certainly deserve when the Houston chapter of the American Jewish Committee bestowed on Archbishop Lucey the first annual Max Nathan Award. On that occasion, the archbishop gave a most forceful and inspiring speech on the life of the migrant laborer. I was most impressed with the archbishop's remarks and am sure that will be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY, THE MOST REVEREND ROBERT E. LUCEY

To be the first recipient of the Max Nathan Award of the Houston chapter of the American Jewish Committee is indeed a distinct honor. I am deeply grateful to the Houston chapter for this favor and to all of you for your presence here this evening. The conferring of this award gives citizens of Texas an opportunity to break bread together in a friendly, cordial atmosphere of good will even though our religious loyalties are not identical; we are Jews and Protestants and Catholics. But we are all Americans and we are dedicated under God to the principle that all men are equal and every citizen has a right to justice and freedom.

For too long we Americans have been quarreling about religion. It seems to me that there is no legitimate place in America for that sort of controversy. This does not mean that religion should be ignored or that discussion of human destiny and eternal truth is out of place. It does mean that as intelligent citizens we ought to be able to conduct religious dialog on a high level of friendship, commonsense and consideration for the rights of others. The bestowal of this award is therefore an occasion of unity, solidarity and good will among citizens of south Texas.

In this period of history we Americans should be united. These are serious times; unnecessary controversy among ourselves is a luxury we can ill afford. Our beloved country is the last bulwark of civilization, of justice, of freedom. In the world community there are two powerful nations which deny the dignity of man and human rights. They are bent on world conquest; they despise the American way of life; they will crush us if they can because we block their path to total, ruthless tyranny. Since these Communist governments do not believe in God they cannot believe in man because the creature has dignity only when he stands in the reflected grandeur of his Creator.

These two countries of the East have placed in jeopardy our survival as a nation. They plan to preside at our funeral; they have in mind to bury us. Our job today is to prove to ourselves and to the family of nations that we are worthy of survival. Lipservice to human rights no longer has value. The 20th century has caught up with those unworthy stewards who publicly proclaim liberty and justice for all; but privately try to massacre both liberty and justice for minority groups.

The Max Nathan Award dramatizes the problem of migrant labor in American agriculture. It points an accusing finger at the iniquities of that program; at the injustices which are a blot on our escutcheon; at a situation which I have described publicly as our badge of infamy, a ghastly international racket.

Migrants may be nationals of Mexico and they are known as braceros or they may be Texans and they are known as citizen migrants. In either case the exploitation of the migrant is almost inevitable. In the first place his position is weak. He stands before his employer defenseless and alone. He needs food and the necessities of life. He has little or no bargaining power. He must work to eat. His children need food. Until this year the employer could hire this man for 50 cents an hour and make him work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, picking cotton. When payday came, the grower could reduce the wage to 30 cents an hour and if the worker didn't like it that was too bad for him. If he happened to be a Mexican national he could be sent home as a troublemaker. Prudence dictated that he be docile, silent, and robbed.

Another reason why the exploitation of migrant workers is almost inevitable is the absence of protective legislation. Much helpful social legislation has been enacted in our country but farm labor has been specifically exempted from most of it. Agriculture is a sacred cow. Certain farm organizations have made it so. Most of the attempts to better the condition of farm labor have been beaten down. Even child labor has been encouraged.

I think it's about time for reactionary growers to join the human race, shows signs of being civilized, and begin to behave like decent Americans. There is nothing particularly sacred about agriculture. The growers are not spacemen from another planet exempt from all laws of honesty and decency; they are not little Caesars possessed of special exemptions and immunities; their business is not a segment of our economy separate and distinct from the stream of American life. American agriculture is not a sick industry; it is very strong.

It is only certain growers who are overstuffed with pride and power. They can pay good wages and make a fair profit if they want to.

By the same token farmworkers are not second-class citizens nor are they less than human. We owe it to them to give them a chance to lead their lives in decent and frugal comfort. There is no reason in logic or morality why the good name of our country should be dragged in the gutter of disrepute to satisfy the greed and rapacity of evil men. We ought to protect the migrant by legislation until he is strong enough to protect himself.

The U.S. Senate has passed several pieces of legislation favorable to migrants; now it is time for the House to do something about an intolerable situation.

Let me express one more thought. The exploitation of migrant labor in American agriculture may seem utterly foreign to us. Most of us are not farmworkers; we live in cities; we know that American industry is powerful. Both labor and management are organized; we are a mighty Nation. Wandering farmworkers seem far away.

But, we must not forget that freedom is indivisible; human rights belong to all. If one large segment of our economy practices tyranny, America is weakened. If we permit human rights to be denied anywhere, they are in jeopardy everywhere. When the rights of minorities are violated, the very idea of freedom and justice is damaged. The atrocities perpetrated against migrants have been the responsibility and the tragedy of all of us.

Our treatment of the migrants in recent years has been unworthy of us as a free people; it has been a national disgrace. Not all farmers are to be blamed; not all growers are dishonest; but the system itself has been wrong. All too often braceros and citizen migrants have been treated shamefully. Now, at long last, public opinion rises up to condemn these iniquities which have hurt our good name around the world, particularly in Latin America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK rose.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his courtesy.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is presently in Geneva, Switzerland, attending as a congressional observer the proceedings at the Disarmament Conference. I commend him for his interest in this subject and in the negotiation of a test ban treaty, and hope that as a result of his visit there he will be able to report progress when he returns to the Senate next week.

The Senator from Minnesota has been much interested, as many of us have been, in the impending visit of President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela, to our country. At the request of the Senator from Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that a statement he would have made to the Senate with respect to the visit by President Betancourt, to which are attached a number of exhibits, may be printed in the RECORD at this point, with the attachments to the statement.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Today we welcome to Washington one of the great statesmen of this hemisphere, President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela.

The government of President Betancourt has become the No. 1 target of Communist attack in Latin America. Operating from Castro's Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent on intimidation, violence, and terror against Venezuela. The recent burning of the Sears, Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracay oil refineries, and the pirating of the ship are all a part of this pattern of violence and subversion.

Venezuela is the No. 1 target because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding there. It is the No. 1 target because the subversion of Venezuela with its huge resource of oil and iron would provide a springboard for the penetration of the entire South American Continent. It would convert the Caribbean into a Communist sea.

The U.S. Government must make it clear to all that an attack on Venezuela will not be permitted to succeed. It will be repelled, regardless of cost. The Betancourt government has made progress despite continuing political attacks from the extreme left and the economic harassment from the extreme right. With the help of the United States it will survive the current external Communist attack and continue to represent a beacon of democracy in a troubled Caribbean.

The government of President Betancourt in Venezuela is a progressive government. It is open and friendly to the United States and vigorously supports us in all international councils. It respects private property, private capital, and investment. It encourages capital investment. And at the same time it sponsors the broadest social reforms and developments for its people. It has strong trade unions, rural cooperatives, and all the things we know about in this country. It is a government that is acting boldly in the fields of housing, health, education, and rural development. The Communists are determined to destroy the Betancourt government because they know that if constitutional democracy succeeds in Venezuela, communism in Latin America will have suffered a disastrous defeat. President Betancourt is one of the great leaders of our hemisphere, and no man has done more to insure the success of the Alliance for Progress.

I recently had the great pleasure of visiting Venezuela and of discussing, meeting with President Betancourt and leaders of his government, and of viewing the Alliance for Progress in action. President Betancourt started his own Alliance for Progress type program of economic development and social reform when his government was inaugurated in February of 1959. The political harassments have been largely overcome thanks to President Betancourt's courage and astuteness. Though the economic harassments have been more unyielding, progress has been made in recent months in improving the pace of business activity.

The government expenditures for education have tripled, reaching the level in 1962 of $231 million. This is 15 percent of the total national budget, the level which the Punta del Este Conference recommended be achieved by 1970. The number of students in elementary schools has almost doubled, increasing from 600,000 to 1,100,000. Under the Venezuelan agrarian reform program, 55,000 campesinos have received their own plots of land. Rural housing and a community development program are underway, and an attack has been started on the problems of eradicating Caracas' enormous slums.

During my visit to Caracas I was privileged to be present for the signing of the $30 million AID loan agreement which will be used for housing and community development facilities in Venezuela. The Betancourt government has developed one of the continent's best health programs. The ministry of health now has a budget of over $100 million a year. It has 19,000 employees, many of whom serve in the network of rural health centers. The magnitude of this program is appreciated when we recall that Venezuela has only 7 million inhabitants. The health program of the Betancourt government has been so successful that accidents are now the greatest cause of death in the 5 to 45 age group.

Although the U.S. Government has given substantial assistance to Venezuela during the past 2 years, most of the above has been accomplished by Venezuelans using Venezuela resources.

A further reason for the cordial relations currently maintained between the United States and Venezuela is the caliber of our representation there. We have in Ambassador C. Allen Stewart one of the top ambassadors in all Latin America. He is a man of courage, resourcefulness, integrity, and strength. He is highly regarded by Venezuelans, by his fellow diplomats, the American community in Venezuela, and by officials of the U.S. Government who know of the job he is doing there.

Recently Ambassador Stewart discussed one of the thorniest problems facing the Alliance for Progress, that of the role of private enterprise in the Alliance. In an address to the Rotary Club of Tachira in the State of San Cristobal in January of this year he stated, "free enterprise is an essential element to the Alliance for Progress just as it is basic to the democratic system. Judiciously regulated where necessary, and complemented by government efforts where it lacks the incentive to perform, free enterprise has provided the mechanism for economic progress of the free world." In this address, entitled "Capital and Confidence: Keys to the Alliance," Ambassador Stewart then spells out the various problems affronting the American businessman in Venezeula in particular and Latin America in general. It is an excellent statement and should be read by all those interested in the partnership of free enterprise and economic progress in Latin America. I attach a copy of the address at this point in these remarks:

"CAPITAL AND CONFIDENCE: KEYS TO THE ALLIANCE

"(Address by U.S. Ambassador C. Allan Stewart before the Rotary Club of Táchira, San Cristóbal, January 22, 1963)

"My last visit to the Andes was nearly 20 years ago as a news correspondent negotiating what was then a rather challenging road from Bogotá to Caracas on reassignment. Needless to say, I am delighted to be back.

"I find on returning as a diplomat, but still with, I hope, a newspaperman's instinct for observation, that the mountains and clouds haven't changed but almost everything else has. There is a modern city where once a large town stood, a refreshing liberal attitude, and a vibrant spirit of progress that has grown with the years. There are new roads, schools, hospitals, industries. Your people are the sturdy Andinos of before, but somehow they seem to move faster and with a more purposeful gait. Táchira, I can say from personal observation, is moving ahead.

"Indeed, all Venezuela is moving ahead, under its new democracy. I seriously doubt that, now that Venezuela has experienced 4 years of progress under a free system, it will ever again tolerate the enslavements of either rightist or leftist dictatorships.

"But I have come not to compliment you but to give you my views on the most dramatic program for social and economic progress ever devised in modern times. I refer, of course, to the Alliance for Progress, an imaginative, comprehensive program involving governments as well as private enterprise, both local and foreign, in a vast cooperative effort to raise economic and social levels throughout Latin America.

"To those prophets of doom who, for reasons best known to themselves, say the Alliance for Progress cannot succeed, let me say just this: Although the Alliance is very young, it already is nurturing hope where there was despair. The challenges have been recognized, and the nations of this hemisphere have committed themselves to an all-out cooperative effort to meet them.

"And further, the cause is right. The nations of Latin America, with basic programs of planning and financing, are capable of providing their people economic satisfaction without denying political liberty. It is a job that has to be done if Latin America's masses are to share freely in the progress of the 20th century. It has been done in the United States and Western Europe, and we are confident it can be done also in Latin America once the needed resources and ingenuity of each of us are committed to the task.

"A new year's letter I received the other day from former Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso, now U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, states the case eloquently. Let me share with you a pertinent paragraph:

"'I think the evidence is clear that the Alliance is moving. The schools and homes, the water systems and roads that are being built, the intense arguments among Latin Americans and between them and us about how best to carry out our charter principles, the mounting defamation of the program by those who see it as a threat to their interests—all this means that we are moving. The rate of Alliance progress depends primarily on the degree of political support of the local leaders and the sense of personal involvement of the people in each Latin American nation.'

"I put great stock in Ambassador Moscoso's evaluation that the Alliance for Progress is on the move.

"But success is not automatic. The challenge is formidable. Success will require patient understanding, imagination, discipline, and a willingness by nations and individuals to study and change outmoded social structures. The first, and greatest, task is rapidly to increase and rationalize economic production in order that more wealth will be available to satisfy the just needs of every Latin American. Any necessary reforms in land distribution, taxes, housing, education, food production, and all other social and economic areas must be investigated and any necessary reforms put into effect if the Alliance is to move ahead with the speed necessary to drastically lessen, in our time, the miseria which has plagued not only Latin America but most of the world since time immemorial.

"The only certainty of the alternative courses of the extreme left or right is that those systems will deny liberty to both individuals and nations. Whether they can even offer sustained economic advance is in serious question. Nowhere, for instance, have they solved the problem of providing adequate agricultural production.

"There still remain certain misconceptions about the Alliance. It must be made clear, for example, that the Alliance is not a U.S. program. True, it was proposed by President Kennedy in his inaugural address. But it was put into motion by the free vote of hemispheric nations gathered together at Punta del Este. The hemisphere accepted it as a 10-year self-help effort requiring the full participation of nations and individuals, private enterprise as well as public. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, in fact, on his recent visit to Venezuela, estimated that the United States cannot be expected to contribute more than 7 percent or so of the total funds needed in Venezuela.

"These funds are and will be in the form of low interest long-term loans which will be repaid. Thus Venezuela will finance, ultimately, its own development.

"The United States is ready and willing to do its full share, but it cannot be expected to finance more than a fraction of what of necessity must in many cases be a vast increase in economic productivity as well as a major overhaul of parts of each country's economic and social structure. The success or failure of the Alliance for Progress depends on Latin America itself.

"Free enterprise is an essential element to the Alliance for Progress, just as it is basic to the democratic system. Judiciously regulated where necessary, and complemented by government efforts where it lacks the incentive to perform, free enterprise has provided the dynamism for the economic progress of the free world.

"There is much fuzzy thinking about capitalism and free enterprise. Not long ago in an Asian university students were asked what ideas, good or bad, they associated with various countries. When it came to the United States, a number of them commented admiringly on U.S. industrial and agricultural production and technological progress. At the same time, a good number of the same students said they did not approve of capitalism—the economic system that produced the very things they admired. Perhaps they were not even aware of the contradiction. These students admired the fruits of capitalism and free enterprise, but, for a vague and obscure reason they could not explain clearly, were opposed to the system that made these products available at a price within the reach of the consumer.

"Marx once said capitalism could only lead to the enslavement of the workers. But the workers in capitalist countries know greater liberty and economic and social welfare than ever existed in the world before, while the workers under the system spawned by Marx have become enslaved.

"Let us turn for a moment to foreign investment, a key factor in the Venezuelan economy; about 60 percent of all Venezuelan Government income is derived from industries developed with foreign capital.

"Most of you appreciate, I am sure, that the fantastically successful U.S. industrial complex could not have begun in the early 1800's without foreign investment—from England, France, Switzerland, Germany, and elsewhere—which went abroad seeking a fair profit. The incentive was profit, true, but the economic world moves on a pivot of profit. To those who decry excessive profits, I point out that the tax structure of a great many countries not only is an important leveler but also a valuable means of financing the spectacular social programs which mark the progress of those nations which from these corporation taxes to which I refer, personal income taxes graduated on a sliding scale, in countries using the system, tend to eliminate the extremes of wealth and poverty which are at the root of social and economic unrest.

"On the whole, I would say that American business operating in Latin America has established an excellent record, especially since the end of World War II. This has been enlightened private enterprise, fully in sympathy with the worldwide revolution against the status quo and concerned with much more than profits. It is a truly revolutionary force which has concerned itself with economic improvement and social growth in Latin America, the basic aims of the Alliance for Progress. There is no doubt that private enterprise must play a central role in insuring the success of the program.

"U.S. investment in Latin America has easily tripled since World War II. Around $10 billion is now staked in Latin America. This investment has increased the national product and incomes of the countries where it has located. It has created jobs, brought social advancement, and has proved a large source of revenue for host governments.

"For example, nearly 20 percent of all revenues collected by Latin American governments come from taxes on U.S. private companies operating in these countries. Such tax payments amount to twice the profits remitted by these companies.

"The U.S. businessman has brought to Latin America the risk capital essential for the development of much of the area's great natural resources and basic industries. He has entered into hundreds of joint ventures with local capital. He has helped train unskilled workers into an efficient industrial force. He has sent Latin Americans to the United States for management training, and he has gradually filled an increasing number of key positions in his industrial and business organizations with nationals of the host country. For example, of the eight local directors of Creole four are Venezuelans. Furthermore, U.S. firms has established excellent records with respect to improvement of salaries, social benefits, safety precautions, and working conditions in general.

"Using the tools, technology, and modern work methods provided directly by U.S. private capital and free enterprise, millions of Latin Americans have had their lives dramatically changed for the better. This is a big part of the Alliance for Progress.

"When you think of U.S. foreign investment in Venezuela you immediately think of petroleum. But U.S. private industry has come into Venezuela in many other fields of endeavor, and most times in partnership with Venezuelan capital. It has gone into automobile assembly plants, food processing and packaging, textiles, banking, insurance, paper, tires, cosmetics, tobacco, and many others. And furthermore, a good many U.S. investors went into business here at the trough of an economic slump, a factor which in itself reflects confidence.

"It has been alleged that the wealthy class in many countries of Latin America tends to hold a great deal of their capital abroad rather than invest it in their own country. No doubt there is a degree of truth in this, more in some countries than in others. By its very nature private investment gravitates toward where it is offered the most attractive returns and greatest security. The amount of capital held abroad will vary according to what the people of the country themselves consider to be the political and economic prospects for their country, as well as with their dedication and loyalty. During the early days of the present Venezuelan administration there were many who lacked confidence. Confidence increases with progress, however, and certainly in the case of Venezuela so-called flight capital has been returning, thus stimulating further progress.

"Part of the capital which left Venezuela during 1959 and 1960 were the deposits which many foreign companies operating in Venezuela had in Venezuelan banks. These companies not only removed their deposits but began using local credit for operating expenses that had previously been financed from their own funds. Now that Venezuelan capital is beginning to return, it is hoped that foreign companies will reassert their confidence by making more funds available to their Venezuelan branches for plant expansion and increased activity.

"I might add in this connection that private U.S. investment cannot be expected to plunge in to fill a void created by the flight of local capital. It is only realistic to state that Venezuelan private capital must continue to return and prove its own confidence. As local confidence is increased, I see no real limit to the amount of private U.S. capital that might come to work with Venezuelan capital, in the light of every prospect for political and economic stability.

"Our two Governments already have a number of cooperative programs underway as part of the Alliance. These are in housing, water supply, agriculture, industrial development, education, public administration, and other important fields. I would like to mention just a few.

"The Alliance is helping both private and public construction organizations to solve Venezuela's housing problem. Some Bs54 million have been lent from the Inter-American Development Bank's social progress trust fund to the rural housing program of the Ministry of Health and Social Assistance. The social progress trust fund is a contribution of $394 million (Bs1,785 million) by the U.S. Government, which is handled and distributed by the Inter-American Development Bank. Here in Táchira, some 786 units have been built under this program, of which approximately 60 were put up with U.S. funds. Over Bs3,260,400 has been invested by the Ministry of Health and Social Assistance in rural housing for Táchira, of which Bs350,000 has come from the trust fund.

"Agency for International Development (AID) loans in the amount of Bs204 million have gone to the Mendoza foundation for housing, the foundation for community development and municipal improvement for slum clearance, and the national savings and loan association to encourage the establishment of a savings and loan system. Both rural and urban housing activities are being complemented by two loans of Bs45 million each from the trust fund for aqueduct construction. At La Fria, INOS will construct an aqueduct system serving more than 4,000 persons with a trust fund loan.

"Venezuela's agrarian reform program is receiving financial assistance in the amount of Bs57.5 million from the Inter-American Development Bank, and Bs45 million from the Agency for International Development to provide agricultural credit to those who could not obtain loans through ordinary commercial channels.

"Another Alliance goal is to help a growing national industry build at an even more rapid rate. Even now, a team of experts from Ebasco Services, Inc., of New York is carrying out Venezuela's first industrial resources survey which is being financed jointly by the United States and Venezuelan Governments. The United States has provided experts who conducted seminars for top management personnel, as well as executive secretaries, simultaneous interpreters, and supervisers in foundry and welding shops. Altogether 748 people have participated in these programs. An additional 30 persons received training in the United States.

"Strong emphasis has been placed on education and training activities with the view of diminishing illiteracy and providing the skills needed for better jobs in industry.

"In education, the United States has equipped an educational materials production shop at the teacher training center, El Mácara, near Maracay. Soon six textbooks prepared there by Venezuelan authors will be in use in Venezuelan elementary schools. These authors were trained by specialists brought to El Mácaro from the United States. And El Mácaro's staff has access to some 18,000 books donated by the people of the United States under the Alliance for Progress program.

"The U.S. Agency for International Development, cooperating fully with your government, is training Venezuelans to conduct courses in elementary and secondary as well as vocational education, business and plant management, and school supervision. Others have received direct training in Puerto Rico, Panama, and the continental United States in many technical fields such as public administration, metalworking, marketing, agriculture, and many more. Some 350 Venezuelans have received such training abroad during the Alliance's first 18 months.

"Although under the Alliance for Progress the United States contemplates putting more than Bs910 million into Venezuela in the form of long-term, low-interest loans advanced for projects which will improve the living standards of the Venezuelan people.

Disbursements of this amount will be made over a period of 3 or 4 years. This figure includes a loan from the Export-Import Bank of Bs450 million and Bs235 million from the Inter-American Development Bank Trust Fund. This is the U.S. Government's direct financial participation as indicated so far, and, as I have said, must be supplemented manifold by local capital to meet the overall need in this country. I might say, in this context, that the United States is one of two countries in the world which more than fulfills the target of devoting 1 percent of its national income to foreign aid.

"Still in the framework of the Alliance, I want to make a special brief reference to the Peace Corps volunteers—90 now in Venezuela—who are helping the Venezuelans see, through their people-to-people activities in many fields of endeavor, the way a little know-how and experience has helped us solve many problems at the community level. I have been impressed by the work they are doing shoulder to shoulder with their Venezuelan counterparts in agriculture, the teaching of English, sports and playground activities, and other fields. A good number are here in the Andes—35 in 21 towns and villages—engaged in 5–V activities in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture. The privately sponsored group called ACCION also is engaged in work along these lines. In both these programs, if their numbers are far short of what is needed, their spirit is certainly one of helpful assistance. A good number of these young people are away from home for the first time. They are trying to learn what the problems are and offer their technical skills to meet those problems. I know they will receive the support and understanding they need.

"I have said on other occasions that Venezuela has been in the forefront of the Alliance for Progress. This is attributable in part to programs which took root here long before Punta del Este, and to the farsighted leadership which carried on that initial momentum through judicious use of Venezuelan and foreign financing under the Alliance. Venezuela has shown the way to the hemisphere in three important respects: first, conscientious economic and social planning to develop and mobilize the country's resources and direct them toward the goal of genuine self-sustained growth; second, the emphasis on self-help measures and internal changes needed to achieve that goal; and, third, the conscious effort to involve as broad a cross section of the Venezuelan people as possible in the process of development.

"Under a free system Venezuela has been able to plan progress and execute the measures that bring it about. Your Government is now in the process of further refining and extending its plans. As you know, a few weeks ago the plan de la nacion was announced—a blueprint for progress to be made in all sectors and in all sections of the country in the 4-year period 1963–67. This plan now is being reviewed by a special committee of the OAS and by private organizations in Venezuela. As it stands, its goal is to increase the gross national product by some 36 percent over today's figure. Taking into consideration a population increase of almost 1 million, the per capita gross national product is expected to go up almost 5 percent. To reach this goal it is anticipated that an investment of Bs28 billion will be available, almost 90 percent from internal sources—two-thirds of it from the private sector. The plan amply reflects the spirit of self-help and involvement of the people.

"Thus, with the elements of planning, self-help and popular involvement, Venezuela is establishing the conditions necessary for balanced economic growth and social betterment within the framework of constitutional democracy. Venezuela has moved ahead with great flexibility toward its goal of ploughing back petroleum revenues to diversify its economy and social base.

"Few Latin Americans can match Venezuela in the self-help measures undertaken to establish a solid base for the Alliance. These include the creation or improvement of social and economic institutions to meet the needs of the people for new industries, housing, agricultural credit, education and training, better health, and a variety of other public and private services. Although a great deal remains to be done, there have been spectacular gains in education, public administration, land reform, irrigation, resettlement, low-cost housing, water supply, malaria eradication, and medical facilities. Venezuela's national planning is far in advance of many countries in this hemisphere, and I would guess that no other country in the world can cite a 93-percent rise in primary school attendance in 3 years through the construction of 4,481 new schools.

"All these actions tend to create greater opportunities for private as well as public investment, and there has developed the beginnings of an upsurge in industrial activity accompanied by the first drop in unemployment since 1958.

"These indeed are impressive signs of progress. Small wonder, then, that the United States has full confidence in the future of Venezuela under its new found banner of constitutional democracy."

On this occasion of the visit of the President of Venezuela to the United States, I am happy to note in the Senate that new attention is now being given in the American scholarly and journalistic communities to making available to the American public basic information on the American Republics in Central and South America. For too long both scholars from the universities and journalists and commentators left the North American public wholly uninformed about Latin America except occasionally to report some bad news—an assassination, an expropriation, an earthquake, or a coup d'etat.

One of the most worthwhile efforts to provide basic information on countries of Latin America is now being conducted by the Institute for Comparative Study of Political Systems, which is a division of Operations and Policy Research, Inc. Both of these institutions are based here in Washington. During the past 6 months the Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems has published two election factbooks on two of the major countries in South America, Brazil, and Venezuela. These factbooks aim to provide the basic data on a country prior to an important national election. The book on Brazil appeared earlier this fall, and in January of this year the excellent factbook on Venezuela appeared. This book contains the basic data on the political history of Venezuela, it summarizes the basic issues which are likely to be of significance in the national election which will be held in December of 1963 and it gives a capsule summary of the major political parties. For anyone interested in following the forthcoming national election at the end of this year, this factbook is invaluable. It should be used by professors and high school teachers, journalists, and radio and TV commentators, by public officials in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and by all American citizens who are interested in the fate of an important American Republic in South America. I congratulate the principal author of these two election factbooks, the man who is the principal driving force behind the Institute for Comparative Study of Political Systems, Mr. George Demetriou. I congratulate the officers of the Operations and Policy Research Corp., which have already done so much to inform the American public and public officials in Washington on the important issues in the field of international affairs. Here once again, the executive secretary of the American Political Science Association, Mr. Evon Kirkpatrick, has performed an invaluable service. I attach an excerpt from this excellent publication on Venezuela for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

"VENEZUELA: AN OVERVIEW

"Before examining the political materials in this booklet, the reader will probably wish to refresh his memory of Venezuela. To help him, the following information is offered first about the country as a whole and then about each of the five regions into which it has been divided for the purposes of anaylsis.

"Venezuela as a whole

"Size: 352,000 square miles. About 1½ times the size of Texas. Sixth largest country in South America. Population: 7,523,-999. Annual population increase over 3 percent—one of highest in Latin America. More than half of population under 20 years. Average life expectancy 52 years. 62.5 percent urban—one of most urban countries in Latin America. Ethnic composition: About two-thirds mestizo; 20 percent white; 9 percent black; less than 2 percent Indian; 8 percent of total population foreign—Italians largest single group. Climate: In Torrid Zone. Temperature varies considerably depending on altitude. Geography: Northernmost country in South America, bordering the Caribbean Sea for 1,754 miles and the Atlantic Ocean for 435 miles. More than 1,000 rivers—Orinoco River eighth largest in world. Beginning at the Carribean coast and moving southward, mainland is characterized by a lowland, narrow at center and broadening at both ends to form the Maracaibo Basin in the west and the Orinoco Delta in the east. This lowland slopes into Venezuelan Andes in the west and the coastal range, which parallels the central and eastern coast. Just south of these mountains lies a large, low, nearly treeless plain which ends in rocky highlands and thick jungles. Economy: Urban and industrial. Oil is axis of economy—provides 90 percent of foreign exchange, 56 percent of government's income, 22 percent of gross national product annual growth, yet employs only 2 percent of the labor force. Standard of living: Annual per capita income $850 in 1961—highest in Latin America. Income very unevenly distributed both regionally and among sectors of economy; heavy concentration in Caracas and other metropolitan areas and in petroleum industry. Cost of living one of highest in world. Exports: World's leading exporter of oil. Chief customers; Western Hemisphere (67 percent) and Western Europe (29 percent); United States alone takes over half the petroleum. Coffee is chief agricultural export. Other exports: iron ore, cacao, sisal, gold, diamonds. Oil 91.9 percent of total value of exports in 1957; iron ore 4.8 percent; coffee 1.5 percent; other 1.8 percent. Imports: Machinery, construction materials, raw materials, nondurable consumer goods, vehicles, food products. U.S. supplied 64 percent of total imports in 1957. Political geography: Divided into 20 States, two Federal territories, and the Federal District. Some 72 island dependencies governed by the Federal District.

"By regions

"Maracaibo Basin

"State: Zulia. Principal cities: Maracaibo (432,902), second largest city in Venezuela; growth due to discovery of nearby oil. Climate and geography: Narrow strip of lowland between Andes and the sea in northwest section of Venezuela. Hot, humid; seldom a day when temperature fails to reach 90° F. Site of Lake Maracaibo, containing largest known deposits of petroleum in South America; lake is shallow and studded with oil derricks. Population: 908,733—12 percent of total Venezuelan population in 6.9 percent of the national land area; 45 percent of

region's population concentrated in city of Maracaibo; 23 percent rural. Economy: Produces nearly three-fourths of national output of petroleum. Good agricultural area. Western portion a center of dairying and cattle fattening. Political characteristics: 12 percent of electorate; 40 percent of population voted in 1958 election.

"Andean States

"States: Táchira, Mérida, Trujillo. Principal cities: San Cristóbal (96,102), sixth largest city in Venezuela; Mérida (40,404). Climate and geography: Cool and moist; spectacular landscapes. Very healthful region. Population: 996,465—13.2 percent of total Venezuelan population in 3.3 percent of the national land area. About 64 percent rural. Economy: Important agricultural region. Chief products: coffee, cacao, sugarcane, rice, wheat, corn, and vegetable fibers. Industrial activity: flour and sugar milling, tanning, and manufacture of shoes, ceramics, and furniture. Mérida reputed to produce best quality coffee in Venezuela. Quaint colonial cities are popular tourist attractions. Political characteristics: 12.9 percent of electorate; 38 percent of nationwide COPEI vote comes from this region. Supplied Presidents from 1899–1958 with the exception of the 1945–48 period.

"Coastal Range

"States: Falcón, Lara, Yaracuy, Carabobo, Aragua, Federal District, Miranda, Nueva Esparta, Sucre. A very heterogeneous region for which generalizations are difficult. Caracas and surrounding area is heart of political and economic activity. Most of Venezuela's largest cities lie in this region. Principal cities: Caracas (739,255), Barquisimento (196,557), Valencia (161,413), Maracay (134,123), Cumaná (71,563). Climate and geography: Mostly mild climate but some parts very hot and humid. Narrow, mountainous strip with fertile mountain valleys. Andes Mountains spur extends west to east for 310 miles and north to south for 43 miles. Population: 3,941,139—53 percent of total Venezuelan population in 8.7 percent of the national land area. Averages 38 percent rural with extremes of no rural in the Federal District and 59 percent in Sucre. Economy: Most important industrial and manufacturing area. Rich agricultural areas. Cattle raising. Caracas is tourist attraction. Pearl fishing in islands off northeast coast. Political characteristics: 53 percent of electorate. Extremist parties strong in big cities of this area compared with strength elsewhere in country.

"Llanos

"States: Guárico, Apure, Barinas, Portuguesa, Cojedes, Anzoátegui, Monages, Delta Amacuro (territory). Principal cities: Puerto La Cruz (59,099), Maturín (54,250), Barcelona (42,267), El Tigre (42,028). Climate and geography: Flat, wide expanses; partly cleared savannahs and partly dense jungles. Torrential rains from April to October; very dry during rest of year. Population: 1,440,371—18 percent of total Venezuelan population in 35.5 percent of national land area. More than 60 percent rural. Economy: Traditional cattle country. Transition taking place—former pastures have been converted into rice, corn, and sesame fields. Very little industrial development. Political characteristics: 19.1 percent of the electorate. Stronghold of the Acción Democrática Party.

"Guayana Highlands

"States: Bolivar, Amazonas (territory). Principal city: Cuidad Bolívar (64,133). Climate and geography: Lies east and south of the Orinoco River. Rocky masses, with high iron content and some petroleum, lead into lowlands and thick jungles ending in spectacular mountains with flat tops and sheer sides. Site of Angel Falls, highest free fall in the world. Large forested areas, largely unexplored. Population: 225,300—3 percent of total Venezuelan population in 45.1 percent of the national land area. About four-fifths of the small Indian population of Venezuela lives here. Economy: Extensive recent industrial development. Iron ore in El Pal Mountain. Gold, diamonds. Largely untapped supply of lumber and minerals. Political characteristics: 2.9 percent of the electorate.

"SOME FACTS OF POLITICAL HISTORY

"The discontinuity of political institutions has been a major characteristic of the history of Venezuela, which has had 26 constitutions since 1830. The highest law of the land has been changes so frequently—sometimes casually, often violently—that it has been little respected by either rulers or ruled. Fifty major rebellions and thirteen violent overthrows of the Central Government occurred between 1830 and 1900. From 1900 to 1935 and from 1948 to 1958 the country lived under brutal dictatorships. Today in Venezuela a legitimately elected President is constantly threatened by militant Communist, leftist, and rightist conspirators, and most of his constitutional term of office has been spent in a state of emergency which grants him extraordinary powers to deal with attempts to overthrow the Government.

"The violent adjudication of political differences is a central aspect of the Venezuelan tradition, and in the 20th century the armed forces have become the dominant institution of Venezuelan politics. Historically the armed forces have supported military dictators; but in 1945 and 1958 the groups within the Venezuelan Army made possible the establishment of civilian governments. In 1963 the duly elected Government, menaced as it is by attempts at violent subversion, could not exist without the firm support of the armed forces. If the military officers who believe that the armed forces should support constitutional government remain in control, it is possible that the present military support will continue and be extended to all future duly elected civilian governments.

"Seven periods

"War of Independence, 1810–30

"Led by Simón Bolívar, its immortal native son, Venezuela won independence in 1821 after 11 years of war that caused heavy loss of life. Venezuela separated from Gran Colombia in 1830.

"Rule of Conservative Oligarchy, 1830–48

"Period of free elections and stable political institutions, honestly administered. Great stabilizing figure was General José Antonio Paez.

"Divisions in Conservative Oligarchy; Rise of the Liberal Opposition, 1848–99

"Period of revolutions and constitutions. "Federalism" and "centralism" were partisan rallying cries, but there were no attempts to create specific structures of government. Developing liberal movement articulated for Venezuela the ideals of 19th century liberalism, but culminated in disillusion engendered by dictatorship of liberal Antonio Guzmán Blanco. Guzmán Blanco did much to modernize Venezuela.

"The Andean Dictators, 1899–1945

"Country ruled by Gen. Cipriano Castro from 1899 until 1908 and by his lieutenant, Gen. Juan Vicente Gómez, from 1908 until 1935. Under Gómez, country opened to carefully restricted petroleum development and army modernized. Period of brutality, terror, and total absence of civil rights. Death of Gómez in 1935 followed by tumultuous riots, destruction, looting, and killing. From 1935 through 1945 country governed by Gens. Eleazar López Contreras and Isaias Medina Angarita, both officers of Gómez; wide range of civil and political liberties granted intermittently.

"Revolt of the Young Officers and Brief Democratic Interval, 1945–48

"In alliance with Acción Democrátia (AD), a group of young army officers led revolution successfully deposing Gen. Medina Angarita. Revolution marked end of dominance of army and landed aristocracy coalition. Mixed civilian-military junta took control. In 1946 open and honest elections held for constituent assembly. Creation of very liberal constitution was followed in 1947 by presidential and congressional elections won by AD party. Shortly after assuming office in 1948 President Rómulo Gallegos suspended constitutional guarantees. AD party opposed by groups on both left and right, and by army officers who, aware that AD was strongly antimilitary, feared army would become inferior group. New military coup ousted elected government in November 1948.

"Counterrevolution of Col. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, 1948–58

"Three-man military junta took over government. Col. Carlos Delgado Chalbaud, head of junta, assassinated in 1950. Pérez Jiménez became dictator. Dictator held elections in 1952. All parties except AD allowed to participate. Election returns honestly counted and reported until it became obvious that government party was losing. News blackout put into effect, followed by announcement that government had won elections. Pérez Jiménez proclaimed President for constitutional 5-year term. At end of term Pérez Jiménez held plebiscitary elections in which people could vote yes or no to his continuance in office. Victory for yes was reported and touched spark to widespread antidictatorial sentiment fostered by clandestine political groups and by elements within the church. In 1958 civilians and parts of army revolted successfully, and new military junta, headed by Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, made election plans.

"The Presidency of Rómulo Betancourt, 1958–62

"All political parties legal participants in elections of December 7, 1958. Elections regarded as free and honest, won by Betancourt and AD party.

"In office Betancourt administration has instituted programs for agrarian reform, building of schools and low-cost housing, reduction of illiteracy, encouragement of private investment, diversification of economy. There is disagreement about extent of success of these programs.

"Constitutional guarantees of civil liberties legally suspended by President Betancourt during most of term of office. How repressive the exercise of presidential power has been is another matter about which there is disagreement

"Betancourt has until now successfully faced constant armed challenge from Communist Party. AD has had two splits since taking power; in 1960 a group separated from AD to become MIR party, and in 1962, another group split to become ARS group. Voting strength taken from AD by dissident groups not known.

"Elective offices to be filled

"President of the Republic.

"Entire National Chamber of Deputies.

"Entire National Senate.

"Legislatures in all 20 States.

"All municipal councils.

"Venezuela is a Federal republic of 20 States, the Federal District, two Federal territories, and a number of minor island dependencies. Since the constitutional 5-year terms of the President and the Members of Congress expire on March 3, 1964, elections have been scheduled for December 1963.

"If they are held, the elections will be for national, State, and municipal offices.

"National offices to be filled are the Presidency, the entire Federal Senate, and the entire Federal Chamber of Deputies. Senators,

elected indirectly in 1958, are now to be elected directly.

"All State legislatures and municipal councils will also be elected at this time. Under the constitution elections for State and municipal offices may not be held more often than once every 2 years or less often than once every 5 years. On January 1, 1964, the term of office for all State and local officials throughout the country will expire. State governors are still appointed and removed by the President."

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HOUSING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the former Governor of my Commonwealth, David Leo Lawrence, has come to Washington, D.C., as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing. He has taken up his office in the Executive Office of the President, at the White House, and has gone to work hard to fulfill the purpose for which he was appointed; which, in effect, is to render effective the Executive order issued by the President dealing with integrated housing.

Last week, in connection with the celebration of Lincoln's Birthday anniversary, former Governor Lawrence made an extremely striking and able speech at Springfield, Ill., on the subject of his new official duties. I commend this speech to all Members of the Senate and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

ADDRESS BY DAVID L. LAWRENCE

I cannot think of any more appropriate place or symbolic time for this conference than here in Springfield—the land of Lincoln—during this week when we observe the anniversary of the birth of Lincoln.

Last Tuesday, on Lincoln's birthday, I was pleased to be among those invited to the White House reception where the 35th President of the United States paid honor to the memory of the 16th president. And I was delighted to see there many of those who have been in forefront of the work to extend the principles and the philosophies which were first set forth in the Declaration of Independence and then put into specific meaning, a hundred years ago, in the Emancipation Proclamation.

Equally impressive at the reception was the publication of a remarkable report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights dealing with the progress the Nation has made in this field during the past hundred years. Entitled "Freedom to the Free" is a volume for all Americans to read, particularly those of us who have helped lead the continuing effort to make certain that we truly achieve freedom for all of the free.

In reading the report, I was struck by a perceptive statement made in 1835 by the young French nobleman, Alexis de Tocqueville, comparing the United States and Russia. "These two great nations," de Tocqueville commented, "started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. The conquests of the Americans are gained by the plowshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and the commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude."

Not only does the analysis remain appropriate in today's troubled world, but it points up, with equal aptness, the vital importance of citizen action such as that being mobilized here today.

The effectiveness of any government action—whether local, State, or Federal—depends directly upon the support of private citizens and upon groups such as those represented at this conference.

You undoubtedly know that there are approximately 200 fair housing committees active in communities from one end of this country to the other.

These are committees, like those represented here, organized specifically for this purpose by citizens who believe their community would be healthier if it is open to persons of all races, colors, and creeds.

The work of local fair housing committees is vital in obtaining local and State legislation to support the objectives of equal opportunity in housing. Their work is no less important in achieving the objective of the Executive order on equal opportunity in housing which President Kennedy signed last November 20.

That action by the President was a historic one, marking the culmination of an evolving process of active forces which caused a shift in Federal housing policy. Not many years ago, that policy was one of supporting residential segregation and unequal housing opportunity. Today, under the Executive order, the policy calls for an active role in preventing discriminatory barriers and requiring equal opportunity in federally assisted and federally-owned housing.

The President, as you know, directed the various Federal executive departments and agencies to take action to prevent discrimination in the housing programs they administer. These departments and agencies have now issued regulations to implement the order in their programs, and the President has appointed me his Special Assistant to head the Committee that will work to see that the purposes of the order are carried out with fairness and integrity. I firmly believe this can be done, and I pledge my best efforts to make certain that it actually is done.

I should like to note, with what I hope is pardonable pride, that my native city of Pittsburgh, when I was mayor, was the second city to enact comprehensive fair housing legislation covering private housing, and my home State of Pennsylvania did the same in 1961, when I was its Governor.

The mounting trend toward equal opportunity in housing is reflected in the passage of State and city measures dealing with equality of housing opportunities by 17 other States, the Virgin Islands, and more than 50 cities.

Such legislation has emerged largely during the decade from 1954, when New York City enacted the first law prohibiting discrimination and segregation in publicly assisted housing, including housing made possible by FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans.

Within the next 3 years, six States (New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Washington, and Oregon) enacted similar statutes. The pace accelerated after December 1957, when New York City again became the first to extend its fair housing law to cover private housing without Government assistance. Thereafter through September 1962, 11 States, 3 cities, and the Virgin Islands enacted fair housing laws covering some portion of private housing. These 11 States have a population of over 65 million or over 36 percent of our total national population. Also they have more than 4½ million or 22 percent of our total nonwhite population of 20,492,000.

These actions reflect the conviction, which I share, that discrimination in housing is a fundamental evil, underlying and supporting the evils of discrimination in public schools, parks, recreation, employment, and most of the other aspects of urban life. Breaking through the barriers of discrimination in housing will release, at the most dangerous point, the mounting racial pressures in our cities resulting from artificial restriction on local housing markets.

Upon signing the Executive order, President Kennedy cogently states his position thus:

"It is neither proper nor equitable that Americans should be denied the benefits of housing owned by the Federal Government or financed through Federal assistance on the basis of their race, color, creed, or national origin. Our national policy is equal opportunity for all and the Federal Government will continue to take such legal and proper steps as it may to achieve the realization of that goal."

The President's order calls for an end to discrimination in the rental or sale or use of Government owned and operated housing and of housing provided, after November 20, with the aid of Federal loans, advances, grants or contributions, or with the assistance of loans insured, guaranteed or otherwise secured by the credit of the Federal Government.

The amount of housing subject to the order is sizable.

For example, the Federal Housing Administration has acquired ownership, through default, of 38,000 homes and 20,000 apartments in developments all across the country that are subject to the provisions of the order. Also, since the order, FHA has insured mortgage loans on more than 12,000 new homes and 50 developments with nearly 6,000 apartments.

The Public Housing Administration has now signed annual contribution contracts for 37 projects of 2,771 units which are subject to the order. It has also asked local housing authorities to amend contracts already in the pipeline to provide assurance of nondiscrimination, and of the 194 such contracts in the South and Southwest only 13 have been canceled because of the order.

The Urban Renewal Agency has signed contracts for 20 Urban Renewal projects that will be subject to the order, and it has taken additional action to prohibit discrimination in the related nonhousing facilities to be built under these projects.

The Community Facilities Administration has signed contracts for 57 Federal loans to build housing and related facilities at colleges and universities, and 10 such loans to build housing for the elderly, all of which are subject to the order.

This is the housing administered by just one Federal agency, the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In addition, as you know, VA-guaranteed loans made after November 20 also come under the order, as does housing under the jurisdiction of various other Federal departments and agencies.

In all this housing, every American is now assured, by the President's order, of an equal opportunity to buy a home or rent an apartment of his choice if he can afford it.

In addition, the President has called upon all units of the Federal Government to use their good offices to help achieve the equal opportunities we are seeking.

Needless to say, there are many other segments of our society who can and should use their own good offices to help make freedom for the free more meaningful.

Your work at this conference, in seeking appropriate legislation, both local and State, which will help reach this objective, is, as I have said before, vital to our overall success.

But it is clear to all who know the history of human progress that the passing of a law or the issuing of an order will not, in itself, accomplish the desired end result.

It requires the work and dedication of each of us, of government, of private citizens, of civic and fraternal organizations, of churches and of every other segment of our society to make certain that the goal is not illusionary and that it is achieved through understanding and active support, not through grudging acceptance.

I think the events of the past hundred years—the progress we have made in civil rights—point to several conclusions. The first, and most hopeful, is that we have indeed come a long way since emancipation was first proclaimed. The second, and most challenging, is a realization of the distance we have yet to go to give true meaning and universal practice of the civil rights for all Americans.

This is something we must do because it is part of the foundation upon which this Nation was founded.

Realizing that, we cannot overlook the impact which our failure to assure equal opportunities has on the rest of the world—on the newly emerging nations, on our European allies, and, of course, on those who seek to defeat us and to achieve world mastery.

Recently the Colorado Supreme Court ruled on the validity of the Colorado fair housing law. Some parts of that ruling were a setback, in that certain key enforcement provisions the law included were struck down. But the court did uphold the constitutionality of the law itself, and it used some ringing language in asserting this position. It is appropriate perhaps to quote some of that language:

"When, as at present," the court proclaimed, "the entire world is engulfed in a struggle whether the American concept of freedom with equality of opportunity shall survive; when tyrannical dictators arrayed against this Nation in the struggle proclaim throughout the world, with some justification, that we do not practice what we preach, and that 'equality of opportunity' is a sham and a pretense, a hollow shell without substance in this Nation; we would be blind to stark realities if we should hold that the public safety and the welfare of this Nation were not protected by the act in question. Indeed, whether the struggle is won or lost might well depend upon the ability of our people to attain the objectives which the act in question is designed to serve."

Those words point up, better than I could, the world challenge of fair housing.

Now it is our responsibility to rise to that challenge—through enactment of laws and through the day-to-day working with others to make certain equality of opportunity is not a hollow shell but an accepted, agreed-upon practice in the land of the free.

In its report on the past hundred years of progress, the Civil Rights Commission also discussed the task ahead and concluded with these words:

"We have come a far journey from a distant area in the 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation. At the beginning of it, there was slavery. At the end, there is citizenship. Citizenship, however, is a fragile word, with an ambivalent meaning. The condition of citizenship is not yet full-blown or fully realized for the American Negro. There is still ground to cover. The final chapter in the struggle for equality has yet to be written."

The whole purpose of this conference and of your participation in its discussions is clear and abiding evidence that you are aware of the task ahead and willing and eager to undertake it. This is the surest indication that there is the spirit and the will to cover the ground yet uncovered and to bring about full citizenship for all Americans.

That is why we are here today—to help write the final chapter in human chronicle of civil rights in this Nation. May we write wisely and well, with the help of Almighty God, knowing full well that it is in His image we were all created.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his courtesy in yielding to me.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced earlier in this session S. 2, a bill to establish water resources research institutes or centers at land grant colleges and universities, to stimulate water resources research at other institutions of higher education, and to promote a more adequate national program in this field.

The Senator from Nebraska gladly responded to the invitation to cosponsor this bill. It is a desirable and urgently needed measure. It should be accorded early hearings and prompt enactment. I shall do what I can to support and advance it.

PROVISIONS OF BILL IN GENERAL

S. 2 proposes Federal financial assistance to land-grant colleges and universities or other competent institutions of higher education in each State, as the State determines, to establish a universitywide water resources research institute or center, in the general pattern of the Hatch Act of 1887 which authorized the agricultural experiment stations. Each State center will be entitled to as much as $100,000 annually on a continuing basis, plus matching funds for specific research or experimental projects. The Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to make grants, matching agreements and contracts with other colleges and universities, States and other governmental agencies, private foundations and other institutions, firms and individuals, to conduct water research projects within the scope of the Department of Interior's mission in the water field. An appropriation of $5 million in the first fiscal year, increasing to $10 million over the next 5 years, would be authorized.

The purpose of the bill is to implement recommendation No. 3 of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. Specifically this select committee recommended that a coordinated research program on water be undertaken to include both research into ways to increase available supplies and ways to increase efficiency in the use of water required to produce manufactured goods and crops. In greater detail, the committee recommended that existing programs be strengthened by taking the following action—page 18 select committee's report No. 29, 87th Congress, 1st session:

(a) Expanding the programs of basic research dealing with atmospheric physics, solar activity, hydrology of groundwater movement and recharge, the physical chemistry and molecular structure of water, photosynthesis, climatic cycles, and other natural phenomena associated with water in all its forms. Such research is essential to a major breakthrough in such fields as short- and long-range weather forecasting, weather modification, efficient management of underground reservoirs, evaporation reduction, desalinization, and pollution abatement, as well as to major improvements in works for the storage and control of water.

(b) Providing for a more balanced and better constructed program of applied research for increasing water supplies through desalinization, weather modification, and evaporation and evapotranspiration reduction.

(c) Providing for an expanded program of applied research for water conservation. Special emphasis should be given to research on improved waste treatment methods, on ways of increasing efficiency in the agricultural use of water, on fish and wildlife needs, and on methods of system planning for the optimum development of water resources of river basins.

(d) Evaluating completed projects with a view to determining modifications to enable them more effectively to meet changing needs, to provide better guidelines for future projects, and to better determine their effect on the local, regional, and national economy.

The committee made four other recommendations. They will be discussed later.

NEED FOR ACTION

The future water needs of the Nation were thoroughly inquired into, studied, and reported by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources organized in 1959. Extensive hearings were held. A report was made to the Senate in January 1961—Report No. 29, 87th Congress, 1st session.

The findings of the committee show how rapidly America is approaching the point at which shortages of available water supplies will constitute a significant barrier to our economic and social progress. It identified major portions of the United States, equal to more than one-fourth of the land area of the mainland States except Alaska, which by 1980 will have very little water to meet the requirements of expanding industry and a growing population. The committee further found that by the year 2000 this condition of water scarcity would extend to an area comprising virtually one-half of the land area of the 48 contiguous States. Maintenance of water quality will be a critical problem everywhere in the United States. Indications of this appear in our newspapers almost daily.

The demands on the Nation's water resources have increased tremendously in recent years. The present 300 billion gallons of daily withdrawal will double by 1980. These demands will triple by the year 2000. These computations are based on medium projections of population increase and on assumptions which include such factors as, first, that there will be continued growth of the Nation's economy at the same rate as in the past; second, that adequate water supplies will be made available under the present general pricing policies; third, that there will be relatively little change in presently known technical methods of water use; and fourth, that with the exception of increased application of techniques for improving the efficiency of irrigation, present methods of using water will continue.

In the course of the testimony on "Supply of and Demand for Water in the United States as Estimated for 1980 and 2000"—see page 123 of report—there is found an outline and summary of three

potential programs for meeting water demands. Each is designed for meeting demands under different assumptions, but all are for assumed medium levels of population and economic growth; a maximum storage-minimum treatment program; a minimum storage-maximum treatment program; and a minimum cost program which would provide for meeting needs at the least cost.

Capital costs of these three programs range from $54.2 to $74.3 billion by 1980. The range by the year 2000 is from $99.6 to $118.3 billion.

The report then makes this very challenging statement:

> Regardless of which of the programs is adopted, five regions, the upper Missouri, upper Rio Grande and Pecos, Colorado, Great Basin and South Pacific, will be short of water under the assumptions made, and will require maximum regulation by 1980.

Mr. President, this brings the problem very close to home for all people of my State because "upper Missouri River region" contains the entire State of Nebraska, among other neighboring States. In fact, Nebraska is the only State which lies entirely within the boundaries of the Missouri River Basin.

In other words, the States in the five water regions referred to will be required to develop fully all available water resources by 1980 or earlier if the projected increase in population is experienced and economic activity is to be achieved.

The year 1980 is only 17 years away.

The foregoing information is just an indication of the startling statistics and other disclosures contained in the select committee series of 32 committee prints issuing its studies. They cause thoughtful individuals to pause; to wonder at the benefactions of nature which has so generously provided for our wants until now; and to consider seriously the methods we must adopt and means we must provide in order to conserve, develop, and wisely use water upon which all human endeavor so heavily depends.

Later in my remarks, I shall discuss the Nebraska situation in greater particular.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

The select committee made five principal recommendations, each of which is supported by voluminous material. Briefly stated, these recommendations are:

First. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States.

Second. The Federal Government should stimulate more active participation by the States in planning and undertaking water development and management activities by setting up a 10-year program of grants to the States for water resources planning.

Third. The Federal Government should undertake a coordinated scientific research program on water.

Fourth. The Federal Government should prepare biennially an assessment of the water supply demand outlook for each of the water resource regions of the United States.

Fifth. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States should take steps to encourage efficiency in water development and use.

The recommendations are based on the committee's belief that future water demands can be met best by a proper combination of the following efforts: (a) construction program; (b) scientific research; (c) development of known technical methods; and (d) strengthening of government policies affecting water development and use. However, the Select Committee Report wisely observes:

> Such a combination of efforts cannot be achieved overnight, and will require the combined efforts of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, as well as a continuation and strengthening of work in these fields by State and local governments and private enterprise.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO ACHIEVE RECOMMENDATIONS

However desirable and well considered any recommendation may be, a proposal to implement it legislatively must also be politically acceptable.

This became very clear two summers ago when the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee sat with the Senate Public Works Committee in hearings on S. 2246, the President's water resources planning bill. This measure was designed to implement the select committee's recommendations 1 and 2 by providing machinery for development of major river basin plans by 1970 and to provide the recommended aid to the States for participation in planning work.

It encountered stern resistance from those who vigorously contend that State water rights are paramount to Federal rights in that field; that they have been for a long time as a matter of national policy; and that they should remain so. This position has been asserted often in the past 50 years since there was first boldly proposed a comprehensive Federal planning program. The concept of national planning was directly opposed to the position maintained for a century and a half and more that the citizens of the individual States have had the powers and responsibilities for the control, use, and development of the water resources within their State boundaries in accordance with local needs and conditions. At any rate, the result of this fundamental, sharp, and irreconcilable conflict of philosophies with regard to the President's bill in the 87th Congress was a complete stalemate.

Since that time, determined effort has been made to agree upon and develop a common ground which opponents on this point can occupy. Senator ANDERSON optimistically noted that some progress has been made, and that the President's proposal to implement legislatively the select committee's recommendations 1 and 2 is being so modified as to prompt him to hope that there will be broader acceptance of the modified 1963 version than there was of the 1961 bill.

Parenthetically, the Senator from Nebraska joins in the hope that sufficiently common ground can be found. I am in full agreement with the statement that there will be water planning the Nation over, because of the growing pressures for water. Planning of some kind will be undertaken whether Congress provides an orderly method or not. It behooves every interested person to exert utmost good faith and diligence to the end that a workable and acceptable method be found as expeditiously as possible.

However, not any price can be paid for such a result. As important as the objectives of the 1963 administration bill for recommendations 1 and 2 are, the fact remains that they are not the sole considerations. The convictions held by so many that citizens of individual States have recognized powers and responsibilities as to control, use, and development of water are deeply held as being vital to continued survival of social and economic progress over the Nation. This is especially true in the semiarid States. The idea of surrendering long-held State preferences in this field leaves them very cold indeed. They will not compromise unduly; nor will they capitulate easily. And they should not.

PHILOSOPHIC BASIS OF S. 2

One direct result of the State-Federal conflict over water supremacy encountered in the last Congress is that S. 2 resorts to the time honored and very successful Hatch Act concept. This approach avoids the bitter struggle and probably hopeless strife as to paramount water rights.

The Hatch Act, originally enacted in 1887—a revision and codification was enacted in 1955—created an agricultural experiment station system at the land-grant colleges and States universities. The pattern of State-Federal cooperation established some 75 years ago has been very successful.

Under the Hatch Act splendid teaching and scientific talent has been made available for the study and teaching of basic scientific endeavors, as well as coping with practical problems of agriculture. Education and research have been combined. Highly trained personnel serve State and individual needs for new and useful information. How well this concept has worked is widely known. American agricultural production and experimentation are the wonders and envies of the world.

Because of its general acceptance, the Hatch Act concept was applied in the drafting of S. 2.

Senator ANDERSON frankly and proudly states that S. 2 is "an effort to copy and expand the agricultural experiment station system and the pattern on which it was built." In his remarks on introducing S. 2, he pointed out that the bill proposes Federal financial assistance to land-grant colleges and universities or other competent higher educational institutions in each State, as the State determines, to establish a university-wide water resources research institute or center in the general pattern of the act authorizing the agricultural experiment station. He specifically pointed out—page 204, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 14, 1963:

> The program does not meet the need for expansion of direct Federal research work on important water problems like pollution con-

trol, weather modification and saline water conversion, nor the need for the Departments of the Federal Government, other than Interior, to use the colleges and universities on research projects in their fields of responsibility. Just as the agricultural experiment stations supplement Federal agricultural research at Beltsville and many other direct Federal agricultural laboratories and research centers, the water research program proposed in this bill would supplement present programs of Federal agencies, not supplant them.

The Senator from Nebraska fully concurs with these declarations.

COST OF PROGRAM

Cost of the program will be of deep concern and great interest to all, and properly so.

Question 1. Can we at this juncture of high taxes and Government spending and the highest Federal Government deficits afford to embark on a research program which authorizes expenditure of approximately $50 million in the next 5 years for this limited water development program?

Question 2. Can the Nation afford a program which the select committee estimates at a gross of some $54 billion to the year 1980 for storage, waste collection, and treatment over all levels of Government?

These sums are astronomical. Perhaps they can be scaled down. But if we extended the period by 10 years to 1990 and would reduce the expenditures by $10 billion, they still sound pretty much out in the realm of the stars.

In an effort to answer these questions, let us reconsider the report of the select committee:

Regardless of which of the (three potential) programs is adopted, five regions, the Upper Missouri, Upper Rio Grande and Pecos, Colorado, Great Basin, and South Pacific, will be short of water under the assumptions made, and will require maximum regulation by 1980 (p. 124).

Mr. President, this is the answer to questions 1 and 2. In the light of the quotation from the report, we can readily paraphrase both of the questions as follows: "Can the economy of the United States continue to grow and prosper—or even to exist—with inadequate supplies of water for our population, our agriculture, and our industry?"

To ask the question is to answer it.

NEEDS WILL BE SUPPLIED

In one way or another, these water needs will be supplied. They must be. As an intelligent, energetic people with some eye to the future, we should go about it sensibly—not haphazardly or tardily. S. 2 is a sound first step. Solidly worked out in concept and in operational methods, the bill will be successful if we give it a chance. It will implement recommendation 3 of the select committee report relating to research.

Mr. President, as for recommendations 1 and 2, the Senator from Nebraska would rather await the introduction of a bill stating in precise and specific language what will be undertaken before making comment. It is my earnest hope that the measure in process of preparation will be sufficiently possessed of "broader acceptance" than the 1961 version. If it does not, it will be opposed. It should be.

Meantime, the task at hand as to S. 2 is one upon which we will find wide agreement. We should proceed in advancing it with such dispatch as we can command.

NEBRASKA'S INTEREST

My home State has been conscious of and highly concerned with water from the time it entered the Union. As a reclamation State, this is understandable.

Our long-time, keen interest, and participation in the Pick-Sloan plan typifies the interest expressed in water resources. All of the State's eastern boundary and a part of its northern line are formed by the Missouri River.

It is with gratification that we witness the substantial completion of the main-stem system of reservoir projects. After years of study, planning, and construction, the vision of farsighted men is materializing in the 90 percent completion of reservoir construction. Eighty percent of ultimate water storage is now available, and 60 percent of the ultimate power capacity is now on the line. Over and above these advantages we have the very vital assurance of water for navigation, industrial, and domestic purposes, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

In this connection we are aware of two factors: First, all of these attainments were pursuant to a plan conceived and authorized by law nearly 20 years ago. Many changes have occurred since then in technology and objectives. Second, the main-stem development is only a part of the development of water resources. There remain the vast demands of geographical and population areas away from the Missouri River main stem for available supplies of water. Likewise, short-term as well as long-term needs must be provided for and planned.

Many water storage and supply structures and works have been completed within our State. Others are under construction, while still others are in the planning or study stages.

We have reached, and maybe gone well into the stage where specific water problems claim immediate attention. In approaching them it would be extremely helpful to have the advantage of scientific studies made by our university addressed to our specific needs, in addition to the general value such analysis would have.

This is particularly apparent when we consider the legislation pending before the current session of the Nebraska State Legislature.

ADVANTAGES TO NEBRASKA

The advantages in having these studies prepared can also been seen by considering the following general propositions:

First, there are several irrigation projects either under construction or in planning in the Lower Loup Valley. It is important to know their ultimate effect upon the streamflow in lower river reaches after these projects are completed.

Second, the effect these and other projects will have on domestic water supplies and their priority under the constitution.

Third, comprehensive studies should be conducted on the subject of the supply of underground water in Nebraska.

We are disposed to think that it is an inexhaustible supply and earnestly hope it will always prove to be. But if future studies will show some indication in years ahead of depletion, it is essential to have technical advice on what system of appropriation to apply to prevent overpumping and what system of priorities to apply with reference to the various 24,000 wells now in existence. In this connection it would be important to know whether these priorities should be on a statewide basis or on a river valley basis and where the boundaries of such valleys are if that will be the area unit.

Hand in hand with this will be discovery and early adoption on a wide basis of more efficient uses and storage practices of this precious natural resource.

All of these and many other subjects of inquiry will fall within the purview of recommendation No. 3 of the report on national water resources, as implemented by S. 2.

All of these subjects will be embraced within the activities of the basic research, studying ways to increase available supplies and methods to increase the efficiency in the use of water required to produce manufactured goods and crops.

Hence, it is readily seen that for the State of Nebraska, in common with all of the reclamation States, and indeed all the States without regard to their geographic location, S. 2 is of highest importance.

It is to be hoped that all of these approaches will be thoroughly canvassed so that the best possible legislation for the purpose at hand can be achieved by this bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE HELPS DEVELOPING NATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, with all of the attention that has been given to the Alliance for Progress and our foreign aid program, there has been an unfortunate tendency to regard assistance to the developing nations as a prerogative of the Federal Government or the United Nations. So it is refreshing and encouraging when one learns that a nongovernmental, privately financed program is rapidly moving into a substantial undertaking of helping a substantial number of people in the developing nations to help themselves, and particularly to help themselves develop within the framework of the capitalistic economic system.

I refer to an organization known as Self Help, Inc., an Iowa-born private

foundation established 12 years ago by one of Iowa's leading citizens, Mr. Vern Schield, an industrialist and farmer from Waverly, Iowa. This organization has a program of collecting used and idle farm equipment which is unsuited for the competitive demands of modern, large-scale agricultural production, reconditioning the equipment, and putting it into the hands of farmers in developing nations where it will aid and advance their farming methods. The equipment has been sent to oversea missions as well as to individuals or organized groups of farmers at a fraction of the cost of new, more modern machines. Rather than using the "handout" approach, the machinery is sold on a pay-as-you-work basis, with no interest on the unpaid balance. Shipping costs are held to a minimum by combining Self Help loads with other shipments. Collection of the used machinery has been assisted by various Iowa and Minnesota Future Farmers of America chapters, and the job of reconditioning is being assisted in the vocational agriculture shops in those States.

The foundation is financed through private contributions from individuals and organizations, and it is rapidly receiving the attention which it deserves to bring it into nationwide operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles from the Des Moines Sunday Register, the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, and the Farmer magazine, giving additional accounts of Self Help, Inc., be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 8, 1961]

MACHINERY FROM IOWANS AIDS PEOPLE IN 23 NATIONS

(By George Mills)

WAVERLY, IOWA.—Vern Schield believes in sending farm tractors to do the Lord's work overseas.

Schield, devout Waverly industrialist, is the guiding spirit and major financial angel of Self Help, Inc.

That organization is sending from Iowa in 1961 an estimated $50,000 in reconditioned farm machinery and other equipment to lands of hungry peoples. Real value of the equipment would be nearer $150,000, he said.

TWENTY-THREE COUNTRIES

Over the years, he has sent machinery to inhabitants of 23 countries through missionary stations of various faiths in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Schield, 58, works on these two principles:

Peoples of less-developed nations must be encouraged and helped to increase their own production of food.

They should buy the needed equipment (on a low-cost basis) rather than accept handouts, which have a pauperizing effect.

"Helping others to help themselves is Christianity in action," he said. "It also is basically American. Helping others to rise to a higher standard of living also is important if world peace is to be achieved."

DEFICIT AHEAD

Schield has a major growing problem. He cannot, and does not want to, charge as much for the machinery as he has invested in it. As a result, Self Help is headed for a deficit of perhaps $25,000 this year and seeking contributions.

He has been contributing approximately $10,000 of his own money to the program each year (plus a lot of time). In addition, he has lent the setup $20,000 this year to pay the bills. It is said that he donated and lent nearly $50,000 to the movement in recent years.

"One man can't do this whole thing," he said. "I've got to have help."

He was particularly pleased when the Waverly Lions Club voted 41 to 4 by secret ballot to cash in a $500 Government bond and donate the money to Self Help.

Self Help was incorporated by Schield 2 years ago and now has an executive director, Ernest E. O'Neal, a onetime Methodist mission worker.

Schield, 5 feet 5 inches and 155 pounds, is founder and chairman of the board of the Schield Bantam Co., which employs 300 persons in this Bremer County-seat town of 6,357 population. The company makes power cranes, excavators, and similar equipment.

Schield became particularly interested in the plight of the less-developed countries in travels around the world in behalf of the Bantam Co.

He visited mission stations of all faiths.

"The church schools are wonderful," he said. "The soil is excellent. There is plenty of rainfall. But nothing much was being produced in the way of food. They didn't have the know-how."

Schield embarked on a course of action based on this biblical verse (James 2: 14–17):

"What does it profit * * * if a man says he has faith but has not works? If a brother or sister is ill-clad and in lack of daily food, and one of you says to them, 'Go in peace, be warmed and filled,' without giving them the things needed for the body, what does it profit? So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead."

Over the last 10 years, Schield has been the principal force in the shipment of 23 carloads of machinery overseas. (Eight carloads have gone out so far this year.) He reports that spectacular crops have resulted in many instances.

IN BRAZIL

Land 600 miles in the interior of Brazil is producing corn averaging 50 bushels to the acre, he says, on land "all cleared with Self Help machinery."

A grinder sent to Nigeria turned out as much fine flour in 20 minutes as a native woman could grind in 2 weeks.

In Kenya Colony, Africa, land worked with a tractor and other equipment produced 60 bushels of corn to the acre, five times as much as the output with the old hand-hoe agriculture.

Machinery has gone to missions of Presbyterian, Catholic, Baptist, and other faiths as well as to Methodist outposts, Schield says.

ORDERS ON HAND

On the Self Help order books now are requests for:

A crawler tractor, bush cutter, disc harrow, and other equipment for an Adventist college in west Nigeria, Africa (total order $2,603); a big diesel tractor, a subsoiler, and a combine made into a thresher unit, for a leprosy colony at Assam, India (total $2,508); a rebuilt 2,900-egg incubator for a rural training institute at Asaba, west Nigeria ($75); a completely rebuilt tractor and farm wagon for a Mennonite experimental farm in Chaco, Paraguay ($1,200), and a washing machine with gasoline motor for the Congo ($107.50).

The mission stations pay the freight.

The reconditioning work is done by two mechanics working full-time in a machine shop located on Bantam Co. property. Schield said the equipment is brought up to as near-new condition as possible. Bearings, crankcases, and other items are frequently replaced and tires are always replaced.

"We do not rebuild this equipment with a paintbrush," Schield commented. "This is not a church rummage sale."

He explained that the tractors and other machinery must do heavy duty far from supplies of parts. It thus is highly important that the equipment be kept in running order. The individual pieces of equipment are kept as simple as possible. Many of the gadgets common on American-used machinery are omitted from the Self Help items.

SHIP PARTS

A major share of Self Help's business is the shipment of parts all over the globe.

Schield hopes some farmers will donate to the cause fairly good machinery that is going unused.

"We've got a surplus of machinery as well as a surplus of corn and wheat," he said.

Gifts of such machinery are deductible for income tax purposes, he added.

Schield declared that many Iowans possess equipment they don't know they have. He told of a north Iowa quarry operator who firmly declared he had no rock crusher. He was taken to the location of the crusher. He was rather embarrassed but he accepted a $40 payment on the item. Self Help spent $200 or more fixing up the crusher and shipped it to India.

"The crusher is crushing bones in India right now for fertilizer and poultry feed," Schield said.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Oct. 28, 1962]

FFA TO AID FARMERS OVERSEAS—YOUTHS WILL COLLECT USED MACHINERY FOR NEEDY NATIONS

(By Russell Asleson)

Minnesota Future Farmers chapters this week will join in a unique people-to-people project to collect used farm machinery for needy farmers overseas.

The farm youths will recondition the machinery if possible and ship it to Self Help, Inc., a philanthropic organization at Waverly, Iowa, that has been making dependable used farm equipment available to underdeveloped countries since 1950.

Coordinating the program in Minnesota will be Glenn Anderson, public relations director of Group Health Mutual, Inc., St. Paul, and chairman of the Minnesota FFA Foundation Finance Committee; W. J. Kortesmaki, executive secretary of the State FFA, and J. W. Baccarini, executive director of Self Help.

The committee will meet with FFA leaders, cooperative representatives, and truckline operators at 9 p.m. Monday in Leamington Hotel to develop methods of transporting the machinery from schools to a central collection depot in the Twin Cities.

Chapter members this week also will begin a survey of farms and dealers in their areas to see what machinery is available. The machinery, obsolete by American standards, will be taken to school shops where FFA youths will work on reconditioning as part of their school projects.

Machines that need more work will be sent to Self Help headquarters at Waverly.

In Minnesota, the FFA members will concentrate on trying to find feed grinders, cream separators, and incubators which are heated by kerosene.

"The project not only will aid FFA boys in their shop training but also in leadership and citizenship," explained Kortesmaki.

FFA chapters in northeast Iowa have aided Self Help for the past year and the project now is being extended on a statewide basis to the remainder of Iowa and Minnesota.

Vern Schield, industrialist and farmer at Waverly who founded Self Help as a private, nonprofit foreign aid program, said the "fine spirit of cooperation received from these FFA chapters has been an important source

of help and support to the whole Self Help program."

Self Help secures the used equipment, handles the reconditioning, and contacts foreign church missions and cooperatives that can get the equipment to farmers.

The machinery is not given away but is sold at about one-fifth its regular price. Schield's theory is that if a farmer pays even a small sum for the machinery, it instills in him a pride of ownership not evident if he received it as a handout.

The price charged overseas covers only the rebuilding expenses and cost of the used equipment to Self Help. Money from these sales, plus contributions, goes into a revolving fund used to buy more equipment.

[From the Farmer, Nov. 17, 1962]

WORLD NEIGHBOR MACHINERY TURN-IN PROGRAM

(By Tom Doughty)

Want to be of direct help to some farm family struggling for existence in India, the Congo or Ecuador? You can. Easily. Take a look around your farm. Turn in, for use in an underdeveloped country, a discarded drag, disk, plow, cream separator, electric motor, feed grinder, generator, pump jack, incubator or even a treadle sewing machine.

Such equipment, reconditioned and put into the hands of farmers in backward countries can advance their farming methods a thousand years—from hand tools to mechanized farming. And, you'll be helping promote democracy, American style.

Such a direct-aid program is already underway. A nonprofit organization called "Self Help, Inc.," started by a Waverly, Iowa farmer and industrialist 12 years ago, is hard at work repairing usable farm equipment and moving it to needy farmers abroad at a cost they can afford.

Last year, several Iowa FFA chapters joined the program on a pilot basis. Now, a Minnesota FFA Self Help program is being launched. Members in Minnesota chapters are this month starting to locate and collect discarded machines and equipment from farms and dealers' lots, do repair work in school shops, then get the machines to Self Help headquarters at Waverly, Iowa. For the FFA'ers it's a new community service project on a worldwide basis. For you, it can be a way of spreading democracy.

W. J. Kortesmaki, Minnesota FFA executive secretary, Glenn Anderson, finance chairman for the State FFA Foundation, J. Wm. Baccarini, executive director of Self Help, Inc., Paul Day, Faribault, president of Minnesota's vocational agricultural instructors, and Ron Gernandt, Lonsdale, State FFA president, are currently helping FFA chapters get the program started on the local level. Target date for movement of reconditioned machinery in large quantities is next March 1.

Self Help owes its inception and rapid expansion to Vern L. Schield, Waverly farmer-industrialist who initiated the idea and founded the organization in 1950 as a people-to-people means of helping farmers in underprivileged areas improve their food productive capabilities.

Travels through the backlands of nearly every country in the world had planted a mental picture of poor farming in Mr. Schield's mind, even in areas of high potential productivity. The prime need, he felt, was machinery for power farming.

"Work in most backward countries is done by hand. And crops are poorly tended," says Mr. Schield. "Such farmers need power equipment to increase their productivity. That, in turn, reduces the number of people required to grow needed food. But it doesn't mean fewer people working. On the contrary, greater productivity means more jobs.

"Backward areas need all kinds of equipment—tractors, combines, plows, feed grinders, ensilage cutters, planters, to name a few. Units that are obsolete by U.S. standards can serve oversea needs very well. Lights, starters, live power takeoff and hydraulics usually are not needed. Best of all, such equipment can be purchased at very low prices in this country. In fact, most of the equipment Self Help needs is found rusting on farms and dealers' lots.

"By sending surplus food to the hungry, we help solve a present problem—that of filling empty stomachs. But until we help them help themselves, we haven't made any real progress."

Movement of reconditioned machinery was a new idea, never before tried by a nongovernment organization. Yet it was simple to carry out—collect idle machinery, repair it to good-as-new condition, send it to oversea missions, individuals or organized groups of farmers, and do it at a fraction of the cost of new machines. Nothing would be given away. Rather than handouts, the pride of the people would be preserved by placing the machinery on a pay-as-you-work basis, with no interest on unpaid balance.

Mr. Schield's first collection of used machinery, from in and around the Waverly area, was "made ready" at the Schield Bantam Co.—a power crane and excavating machine manufacturing company he founded 15 years ago. The first shipment to oversea mission stations included tractors, plows, cultivators, and smaller equipment. It was overwhelmingly successful. So much so, in fact, that demand for Self Help quickly mushroomed. Today, more than 27 carloads of rebuilt equipment have been shipped from the Waverly headquarters to some 23 nations—at one-fifth to one-third the cost of new equipment.

An entire package of equipment can now be readied and sold to an oversea agricultural mission (any denomination), farmer, or group of farmers for as little as $650. This includes a small, one-plow tractor (8 to 10 years old), rebuilt and re-tired, plow, harrow, cultivator, and a rebuilt stationary hammer mill. In contrast, a team of oxen plus their feed for 20 years, would cost a farmer in India at least $600.

Shipping costs are paid by mission stations or other recipients of the equipment. These costs are kept at a minimum, however, by combining Self Help loads with other oversea shipments.

Because of small farms (4.2-acre average in India), small tractors and equipment are preferred. And, some equipment needs alteration to fit native farming conditions. A combine, for instance, usually is converted for use as a stationary thresher.

Self Help operates only in areas where people are too poor to buy new American-made machinery. It does not compete with manufacturers or dealers selling new equipment abroad. In fact, most of them like and agree with the idea. Self Help, they say, by selling used machinery at prices farmers can afford to pay, will give them a start toward developing an economy, become more self-sufficient and eventually allow them to buy newer American-made products.

It is doing just that. Where corn yields were 9 to 12 bushels per acre, they now are 60 bushels. A small grinder does in 10 minutes what it formerly took a native woman 2 weeks to do. Where a number of native women "farmed" small, garden-sized plots, a cooperative farm field of several acres now is operated by native men.

On this end, cooperation from farmers, machinery dealers and manufacturers has been excellent. Tractors and other equipment have been donated or sold at below-cost or even junk-price levels. Such parts as bearings, piston rods and tires have been contributed free or at below-cost levels. (Donations of equipment, parts or money are tax deductible, point out Self Help officials.)

Day by day, Self Help is growing under its own momentum, says Executive Director J. Wm. Baccarini. Requests are pouring in from all parts of the world, for not only field equipment but for such things as generators, welders, sewing machines, washing machines, powersaws, grinders, and even kerosene-operated egg incubators. Most shipments, so far, have gone to agricultural missions and Peace Corps areas, where experienced operators can give instruction in proper use.

The job of reconditioning the equipment has outgrown facilities of Self Help headquarters at Waverly. This is why Iowa and Minnesota FFA chapters have been invited to help by collecting equipment and rebuilding it in school vo-ag shops. Once the program is underway in these two States, invitation will be extended to FFA chapters in other States.

Money, of course, is another major concern. Mr. Schield has contributed $10,000 or more per year, plus loaning $20,000 to the organization last year. (Self Help, Inc., is a legal, nonprofit corporation entirely separate from the Schield Bantam Co.) This money goes toward paying for equipment not donated, cost of rebuilding it, and for financing office operations of Self Help, Inc.

Money returned from oversea sales goes into a revolving fund—used to buy and rebuild more equipment. Contributions from individuals and civic, commercial and church organizations also are coming into the revolving fund. As yet, however, Self Help still is operating on a deficit basis (that's why Mr. Schield loaned $20,000 last year).

Part of the revolving Self Help fund will be used to reimburse participating FFA chapters—for parts, paint and such that they must buy. But the time, labor and skill FFA'ers put into collecting and rebuilding will amount to a very great contribution, points out Mr. Baccarini.

He adds: "Self Help hopes more people will ask about the many possibilities open to them—to help people in underdeveloped nations help themselves."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1963:

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Louis M. Janelle, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years, vice William H. Craig, Jr., resigned.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico, vice Carl A. Hatch, retiring.

U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching

staff of the Academy as an instructor with the permanent grade of lieutenant:

Frank S. Kapral

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutentants

James H. Blumer
Charles W. Mathisson
Bruce I. Williams
Archibald J. Patrick
R. Lawrence Swanson
James Collins
George A. Maul
Robert A. Trauschke
Ralph J. Land

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Archibald J. Patrick
R. Lawrence Swanson
James Collins
George A. Maul
Robert A. Trauschke
Ralph J. Land
Francis D. Moran
Robert E. Lushene
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Charles K. Paul
Dee E. Kimbell
Dewaine Seets
Andrew Tczap
Sigmund R. Petersen

To be ensigns

Kenneth V. Marovich
Edward P. Cline
Jeffrey G. Carlen
David L. Des Jardins, Jr.
Norment A. Barnes, Jr.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1965, vice Edwin R. Price, deceased.

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

1. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeon

Joseph C. Robinson

To be surgeon

Jerry C. Rosenberg

To be senior assistant surgeons

N. Burton Attico
John P. Blake
Ormond V. Brody
Rawser P. Crank, Jr.
Anthony N. Damato
Raymond A. Dieter, Jr.
Rodney G. Elliott
Frank P. Greene
Wallace H. Holthaus
James E. Maynard
Leslie G. Nelson
Thomas B. Stucker
Christfried J. Urner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Paul L. Beckley
Douglas G. Bell
William F. Bird
Clinton C. Cox
Stanford E. Hamburger
John S. Huling, Jr.
Val D. Jensen
Orlen N. Johnson
Sanford Krotenberg
Winslow B. Lee
Gene P. Lewis
Rollie W. Lyman
Glenn W. Smith
John J. Timmermans

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Francis G. Mattern
Donald G. Remark

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Francis M. McGowan
Donald W. Mantay
Lowell A. Van Den Berg

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

B. David Clark
Walter W. Liberick, Jr.
Edgar D. Preissner

To be assistant pharmacist

Henry W. Winship III

To be junior assistant pharmacist

James C. Yatsco

To be scientist

Samuel L. Buker

To be senior assistant sanitarians

John R. Bagby, Jr.
Harry Haverland
Wendell C. McElwee
Gene W. McElyea

To be assistant sanitarian

Gerald J. Lauer

To be veterinary officer

James R. Ganaway

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Carl E. Miller
Robert D. Phemister

To be senior assistant dietitians

Lois R. Seidler
Betty J. Shuler

To be senior assistant therapists

John B. Allis
Thelma L. Reeder

To be assistant therapist

Gary L. Smidt

To be health services officer

David D. Haworth

To be senior assistant health services officer

Robert H. Bradford

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of section 1211, title 10, United States Code:

To be major

Gene W. Oehlman, [redacted].

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be majors, USAF (Chaplain)

Bernard M. Delos, [redacted].
John T. Donnelly, [redacted].
Arthur T. Engell, [redacted].
Luther C. Goebel, [redacted].
George M. Hickey, [redacted].
Spencer D. McQueen, [redacted].
George E. Mennen, [redacted].
Ralph R. Pace, [redacted].
Hoyt H. Wood, [redacted].

To be major, USAF (Medical)

Kenneth S. Shepard, [redacted].

To be captains, USAF (Chaplain)

Earl W. Barcome, [redacted].
Donald E. Bartone, [redacted].
George H. Bause, Jr., [redacted].
Preston C. Brown, Jr., [redacted].
William J. Haley, [redacted].
Edward B. Hemkens, [redacted].
Thomas D. Holland, [redacted].
William H. Jacobs, [redacted].
Raymond J. LeVay, [redacted].
Lloyd W. Lyngdal, [redacted].
William F. Mattimore, [redacted].
James G. O'Malley, [redacted].
William J. Wozny, [redacted].

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Duane C. Feichtinger, [redacted].
Richard C. Hayward, [redacted].
Michael F. Noone, Jr., [redacted].
Buford E. Phillips, Jr., [redacted].
Charles M. Stewart, [redacted].
Rose L. Volino, [redacted].

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Henry V. A. Bielstein, [redacted].
John F. Brix, Jr., [redacted].
William O. Crawford, Jr., [redacted].
George A. Farber, [redacted].
Donald G. Fisher, [redacted].
Norman L. Gamse, [redacted].
Herbert F. Gretz, Jr., [redacted].
John K. Legan, [redacted].
Willard L. Meader, [redacted].
Joseph A. Neal, [redacted].
Constantine J. Nonas, [redacted].
Joseph J. Pollock, [redacted].
James T. Shallow, [redacted].
Robert V. Tompson, [redacted].

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Rolando Bernui, [redacted].
Melvin G. Fitch, [redacted].
William J. Frome, [redacted].
James A. Hardeman, [redacted].
Conrad E. McFee, [redacted].
Lawrence J. Myers.
N. Joseph Nassif, [redacted].
Ralph M. Ohta, [redacted].
William L. Swartz, [redacted].

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

Shirley J. Delaney, [redacted].
Evelyn C. Doerty, [redacted].
Brooks V. Frederick, Jr., [redacted].
Alberta P. Nelson, [redacted].
Theda Schneiter, [redacted].
Betty J. Sones, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Chaplain)

Robert A. Brucato, [redacted].
Wilbur W. Bubb, [redacted].
Richard L. DePriter, [redacted].
Emilio Falcone, [redacted].
Melvin H. Garritson, [redacted].
Harland R. Getts, [redacted].
Benjamin F. Kelley, [redacted].
George C. Kramer, [redacted].
Richard J. Kucharski, [redacted].
Marvin L. Labinger, [redacted].
Robert B. Lantz, [redacted].
John J. Lehman, [redacted].
Stuart H. Lengel, Jr., [redacted].
Joseph E. McCausland, [redacted].
Thomas McManus, [redacted].
Sigurd J. Nelson, [redacted].
Stephen J. Olivier, [redacted].
George H. Quarterman, Jr., [redacted].
John G. Truitt, Jr., [redacted].
Paul H. Wragg, Jr., [redacted].

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Willian D. Arrowood, [redacted].
Thomas V. Ball, [redacted].
William W. Brooks, [redacted].
Elvir A. Fay, [redacted].
Willis L. Mog, [redacted].
Robert H. Perkins, [redacted].
Thomas E. Playle, [redacted].
James W. Riner, [redacted].
Ramutis R. Semeta, [redacted].
Harold A. Teeter, [redacted].
Harland G. Woody, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Eldon E. Bell, [redacted].
Robert A. Hummel, [redacted].
Edward H. Wood, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Lawrence L. Clark, [redacted].
Robert J. Douglas, [redacted].
John R. Kelley, Jr., [redacted].
James E. McCormick, [redacted].
Paul R. Park, [redacted].
Charles J. Rekow, [redacted].
Arthur H. Streeter, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

David C. Beatty, [redacted].
Bob L. Carpenter, [redacted].
Raymond J. Collins, [redacted].
Eugene L. Elliott, [redacted].
Frontis W. Ergle, Jr., [redacted].
Donald S. Good, [redacted].
Gerald R. Heckman, [redacted].
Robert R. Riedle, [redacted].
John F. Riley, [redacted].
Richard G. Schmitt, [redacted].
Robert D. Smith, [redacted].
Foye O. Stacey, [redacted].
Donald R. Tuleja, [redacted].
Wendell O. Ussery, [redacted].
Robert A. Williams, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Veterinary)

Bobby L. Caraway, [redacted].
Duane A. Gray, [redacted].
Sidney R. Jones, [redacted].

Gale D. Taylor, xxxxxxxxx.
Thomas L. Wolfie, xxxxxxxxx.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Carol J. Bennett, xxxx.
William M. Cooper, xxxx.
Mildred J. Cox, xxxx.
Philip DiBlasi, xxxx.
Darlene M. Dodd, xxxx.
Betty J. Harper, xxxx.
Marlene J. Henson, xxxx.
Dorothy M. Knight, xxxx.
Barbara R. Lynch, xxxx.
Dolores A. Malota, xxxx.
Sarah J. McCann, xxxx.
Pete Navarro, xxxx.
Claridith J. Plott, xxxx.
Paul C. Shalenko, xxxx.
William D. Sharadin, xxxx.
Katherine C. Snuggs, xxxx.
Joseph D. Witmer, xxxx.
Faye Woodruff, xxxx.
Dorothy N. Zablocki, xxxx.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Charles J. Archibald, xxxxxxxxx.
Conrad L. Bush, xxxxxxxxx.
Raymond D. Christian, xxxxxxxxx.
John E. Dexter, xxxxxxxxx.
James D. Edwards, xxxxxxxxx.
James V. Gordon, xxxxxxxxx.
Karl L. Kilpatrick, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard G. Micka, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert J. Perlstein, xxxxxxxxx.
Clarence J. Schumaker, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Harry J. Simpson, xxxxxxxxx.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major

Wilfred V. Gabel, xxxxxxxxx.

To be captain

Frank C. Knaack, xxxxxxxxx.

To be first lieutenant

Lynn R. Wolfe, xxxxxxxxx.

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

Gerald Serina, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard E. Young, xxxxxx.

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduates

Peter S. Coe, xxxxxxxxx.
William E. Phillips, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Klaus H. Stuecklen, xxxxxxxxx.

Distinguished Officer Training School Graduates

Leroy P. Ache, xxxxxxxxx.
William E. Adams, xxxxxxxxx.
Charles H. Bailey, xxxx.
Joseph P. Bigelow, xxxxxxxxx.
Frank J. Blattner, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Robert A. Bleau, xxxxxxxxx.
David C. Bray, xxxxxxxxx.
Michael H. Catherall, xxxxxxxxx.
Ford F. Challis, xxxxxxxxx.
Herman E. Chelette, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Wilbur R. Clopton, xxxxxxxxx.
James M. Connolly, xxxxxxxxx.
Dale D. Conrad, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard C. Corbin, xxxxxxxxx.
Fred E. Croshaw, xxxx.
James A. Curtis, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Jerome B. Dague, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert V. Daigle, xxxxxxxxx.
Marshall E. Daniel, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Ronald L. DeCosmo, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard A. Deinhammer, xxxxxxxxx.
Theodore M. Duigon, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Richard R. Eiles, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert J. Elliott, xxxxxxxxx.
Warren G. Elliott, xxxx.
Francis L. Eubank, Jr., xxxx.
Lawrence J. Faessler, xxxx.
William C. Fahey, xxxx.
Edmund H. Fording, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
James A. Gabel, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert J. Goldman, xxxxxxxxx.
Charles E. Gordon II, xxxxxxxxx.
Gerald D. Gordon, xxxxxxxxx.
Peter A. Gouette, xxxxxxxxx.
Larry J. Graham, xxxxxxxxx.
Howard W. Green, xxxxxxxxx.
Thomas M. Hammons, xxxxxxxxx.
James H. Handy, xxxxxxxxx.
David C. Harvey, xxxxxxxxx.
Andrew L. Higgins, xxxxxxxxx.
Ronald H. Hilbert, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert C. Hogrefe, xxxxxxxxx.
Jo Ann Holmes, xxxx.
Robert L. Hosler, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard H. Houtary, xxxxxxxxx.
Gary R. Jackson, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert M. Jacobs, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert B. Jones, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert F. Kieser, xxxxxxxxx.
George S. King, xxxxxxxxx.
James A. Kirsch, xxxxxxxxx.
Edward E. Klehr, xxxxxxxxx.
Elwood N. Laugen, xxxxxxxxx.
James A. Lee, xxxxxxxxx.
Samuel R. Lehman, xxxxxxxxx.
David E. Loberg, xxxxxxxxx.
Albert W. Long, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Peter R. H. Luckenbach, xxxxxxxxx.
John G. Magee, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Dean L. Mather, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert C. McClain, xxxxxxxxx.
Jack E. McCormick, xxxxxxxxx.
Nancy J. McDearman, xxxx.
Patrick H. McHargue, xxxxxxxxx.
Hugh McPheeters, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Michael Monaco, xxxxxxxxx.
Donald D. Monkres, xxxxxxxxx.
James R. Murphy, xxxxxxxxx.
Ronald J. Nelson, xxxxxxxxx.
Raymond P. O'Brien, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard W. Ogden, xxxxxxxxx.
Norman R. Otters, xxxxxxxxx.
Galen M. Ozawa, xxxxxxxxx.
John K. Paige, xxxxxxxxx.
Donald S. Palmer, xxxxxxxxx.
Ronald D. Parham, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard V. Parish, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert E. Patterson, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard A. Peacock, xxxx.
Robert D. Penman, xxxxxxxxx.
Otto W. Peucker, xxxxxxxxx.
Richard L. Picard, xxxxxxxxx.
Louis A. Platterborze, xxxxxxxxx.
Thomas J. Pollard, xxxxxxxxx.
Charles F. Power, xxxxxxxxx.
George E. Powers, xxxxxxxxx.
Donald F. Prince, xxxxxxxxx.
Jeannette C. Pulver, xxxx.
Tom V. Purser, xxxxxxxxx.
Byron G. Quann, xxxxxxxxx.
David P. Reimuller, xxxxxxxxx.
John B. Rich II, xxxxxxxxx.
Lewis M. Roome, xxxxxxxxx.
John P. Rooney, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Thomas E. Rowley, xxxxxxxxx.
Alan S. Rutherford, xxxxxxxxx.
Edward J. Ryan, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Robert J. Sanders, xxxxxxxxx.
Charles A. Savage, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Jack S. Scheiffler, xxxxxxxxx.
Arnold L. Schwalb, xxxxxxxxx.
Edward M. Seghers, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Douglas E. Shamberger, xxxxxxxxx.
Raymond A. Shapek, xxxxxxxxx.
Walter R. Sharpe, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Howard F. Shenk, xxxxxxxxx.
Bruce N. Smith, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert M. Smith, xxxxxxxxx.
James Souhrada, xxxxxxxxx.
Parker D. Sproul, xxxxxxxxx.
Warren L. Steininger, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
William H. Strehle, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Edward L. Sutter, xxxxxxxxx.
Harold K. Switzer II, xxxxxxxxx.
Anthony J. Terlep, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Donald L. Thompson, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert T. Thompson, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Victor R. Trouy, xxxxxxxxx.
William M. Turner, xxxxxxxxx.
Ralph M. Tyson, xxxx.
Richard S. Ueland, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Rene M. Vicknair, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Joseph L. Vojir, xxxxxxxxx.
Fredrick A. Wagner, xxxxxxxxx.
William J. Weiland, xxxxxxxxx.
David R. Welsh, xxxxxxxxx.
Bruce M. Westbrook, xxxxxxxxx.
Harold E. Wigginton, xxxxxxxxx.
J. Leon Wilson, xxxxxxxxx.
Thomas W. Wing, xxxxxxxxx.
Warren W. Wolff, xxxxxxxxx.
Thomas W. Young, xxxxxxxxx.

Distinguished Graduates, Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps

Todd Bolen, xxxxxxxxx.
Robert E. Gallo, xxxxxxxxx.
Gary K. Pritchard, xxxxxxxxx.
Darrel D. Thomssen, xxxxxxxxx.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I John 4: 21: *This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God must love his brother also.*

Almighty and ever-blessed God, grant that in this Brotherhood Week we may have a clear vision of the high and helpful things which we may do together for the health and happiness of all mankind.

Make us humbly grateful for the many opportunities that are continually coming to us to speak a word of good cheer and to extend a hand of helpfulness to the needy members of the human family.

May we realize more fully that the question "Am I my brother's keeper?", must be answered conclusively in the affirmative.

Enable us to go in and out among our fellow men as the heralds of a new day when men and nations shall live as brothers on the high levels of peace and good will.

Help us to practice the Golden Rule and inspire us with those finer thoughts and feelings that are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a nobler civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1963, was read and approved.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 21, 1963, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the approval of the Journal on February 21, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today and also on February 19, 25, and 26.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the somber monuments of the Hitler-Stalin era is the continued occupation of ancient free nations by foreign systems. The Lithuanian Republic is still occupied and controlled by the Soviet Union. It is the victim of a period in human history when small nations were exchanged like pawns in the savage confrontation between the Nazi and Soviet warlords.

The Soviet army marched into Lithuania in 1939 after the Hitler-Stalin Pact had given the Nazi war machine a free hand in Western Europe and Hitler paid the price by agreeing that Stalin could occupy the Baltic Republics.

The fighting of the war that followed is long since ended, but the Soviet occupation of Lithuania continues. The people of Lithuania deserve something better. They deserve the moral support that we can give them by recognizing their contributions to freedom and their honorable history.

In this country, tens of thousands of Americans of Lithuanian descent celebrated this month the anniversary of a better day—the day in 1918, February 16, when the people of their fatherland proclaimed their independence of both old imperial Germany and revolutionary Russia.

They set up a republic. They organized their society as a free people. They asserted their right to live free of foreign aggression from whatever source.

In the brief decade Lithuania had, it established its place in the forefront of progressive democratic societies. It pushed an educational program that cut the rate of illiteracy from two-thirds of the people to less than 15 percent. The Lithuanian Republic adopted the first land-reform law of modern Europe.

All of this was built upon a cultural and national tradition that goes back to the 13th century. It was created by people who welcomed the chance to spend their energies in proving their right to an independent place in the world.

The land of the Lithuanians is occupied by the Soviets, but we have a right to doubt that the spirit of the people is conquered.

The U.S. Government has quite properly declined to recognize the legality of the Soviet seizure of power in Lithuania. It has never accepted the attempted liquidation of the Republic. At the time when in their hearts there is a silent celebration of their 1918 Independence Day, it is proper for us to wish the people of Lithuania well, to assure them that they are not forgotten.

UNITED NATIONS FUNDS TO CUBA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing international problems which faces the Congress and all of the American people is that of Cuba. Here we find a Communist government only 90 miles off the coast of Florida, actively supported by troops of the Soviet Union.

It seems to me that this Nation cannot rest as long as Castro and his kind remain in power in our hemisphere. The subversive activities of his government to the other Latin American nations poses more of a threat than that of the weapons and Soviet troops that remain in Cuba.

I supported the President's firm action in having the missiles and missile bases removed from Cuba, and I believe this Nation must have just as firm a policy in dealing with this Communist dictatorship to insure its eventual overthrow.

As a Member of the Congress, an action by the United Nations last week shocked me. We find that the United Nations Special Fund has approved a 6-month test plan for Cuban crop diversification. I wrote U.N. Ambassador Stevenson a vigorous denunciation of this act which I consider an insult to the United States.

The program calls for a reported $100,000 to be spent by the U.N. in this test program, and if successful, to be extended for 5 years with the U.N. share of the eventual cost to be $1.2 million.

The remarks of Paul G. Hoffman, American manager director of the Fund, that no American funds would be used in this project is ridiculous on the face of it. We have, in this Nation, attempted to keep the United Nations a forum for world discussion, paying a far heavier than proportionable share of the United Nations operating expenses, and then find this organization giving aid to the Communist menace only 90 miles off our shore.

I called on Ambassador Stevenson for an explanation, pointing out that we find our country in the position of giving funds on one hand, to be used by our sworn and mortal enemy on the other.

I regard this action of the U.N. an insult to the United States and have vigorously expressed my indignation.

To my mind the problem of Cuba is the No. 1 foreign policy problem which faces this Nation. It cannot be swept under a rug. It cannot be hidden. Only strong and forceful leadership will enable us to blot out this menace to our Nation and the free world's security, and for my part, I pledge my every effort to hasten the day when Castro will be defeated and a truly free Cuba restored.

COMMUNIST THREATS TO THE SECURITY OF THIS HEMISPHERE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, today the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs opens its hearings into the vital matter of Communist threats to the security of this hemisphere.

In this regard, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article by Mr. James Free, of the Washington Bureau of the Birmingham, Ala., News.

Mr. Free points out the qualifications and extensive experience of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs to conduct these investigations in the interests of our Nation and our hemisphere.

Mr. Free's article follows:

SELDEN AND STENNIS CALLED GOOD BETS TO GET FACTS ON CUBA

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Strictly down-the-middle probes of the Russian buildup in Cuba can be expected from both subcommittees of Congress that will buckle down to the task after the lull this week for Lincoln's birthday.

The two chairmen, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, and Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, Democrat of Alabama, are conservative Southerners with no close administration ties.

While they will not hesitate to bring out facts embarrassing to the Kennedy administration, neither will they have any compunction about making a report that might pull the rug out from under Republican charges against the administration.

Moreover, between the two investigating groups, the American people should be able to get a comprehenisve picture of Russian strength in Cuba and the extent of the threat to this hemisphere.

STENNIS' Preparedness Subcommittee will center its attention on military aspects, with subversion and related dangers being secondary but significant matters of concern.

SELDEN'S Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee will stress the extent of the Communist subversion threat from Cuba to Latin America on a country-by-country basis. Comparative military power will be considered only as it pertains to the ability of various countries to resist subversion.

Both STENNIS and SELDEN will inquire into present long-range U.S. policy regarding Soviet military bases and forces in Cuba or elsewhere in the Americas. Here, again, emphasis of the Senate subcommittee will be on defense policy, while concern of the House foreign affairs group will be on diplomatic policy.

Beyond question, there will be some duplication in the information brought out by the two investigating subcommittees. But this should help assure a balanced perspective and provide more varied sources of information.

STENNIS' handling of hot past probes—the muzzling-the-military hearings last year, for example—has won him a reputation as a steady, impartial, and cool man with a gavel. His early years as a circuit judge show through clearly.

SELDEN has yet to prove his mettle in highly publicized hearings. But House colleagues point to his early and largely ignored warnings on Cuba, first to the Eisenhower administration and later to the Kennedy administration. They note his leadership in prodding the Organization of American States into taking action against Castroism.

Neither chairman is given to sensationalism. Both have been dissatisfied with the Kennedy administration tendency to rate the Soviet buildup mainly in terms of "offensive" or "defensive" weapons.

SELDEN and STENNIS, as well, have had fully as much information about Russian troops and weapons in Cuba as have had the Republicans who publicly charged the administration with sugar-coating the story.

Neither chairman has remained silent on Cuba, but any comment has been restrained. Back on December 18, for example, SELDEN told this reporter there were "at least 15,000" Soviet troops in Cuba. This was some time before the administration admitted this officially.

SELDEN'S subcommittee will conduct 3 days of hearings starting February 18. Two comparable periods of testimony will be scheduled later.

STENNIS' subcommittee so far has heard only one witness: John A McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in closed session. But other witnesses will testify starting probably week after next. And several weeks of additional hearings are in prospect.

THE FALLACY OF TOO MUCH PLANNING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, some time back a large audience heard an acknowledged eloquent speaker say:

> I do not believe that Washington should do for the people what they can do for themselves through local and private effort. There is no magic attached to tax dollars that have been to Washington and back.

These words have a ring of truth. They are a simple statement of fact, and are quoted from a speech made before the Associated Business Publications Conference, held at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, on October 12, 1960.

They were made in connection with a discussion of American economic policy, and underscored a plea for a strong economy in our country, thus "not only to sustain our defenses, but also to demonstrate to other nations, particularly those wavering between our system and the Communists—that the way of freedom is the way to strength and security—that their future lies with us and not with the Soviet Union."

That portion of the speech I have just quoted ends with this statement:

> That is the basic issue of 1960—and that is why each candidate must make clear his views on economic policy.

Now, lest some who read this immediately assume the speaker was one of those labeled as "reactionary"—of whom it has been said "he has one eye ahead and one eye on the rearview mirror"—let me identify the eloquent speaker whose words opened and have been quoted in this statement of mine. It was Senator John Fitzgerald Kennedy, running for the highest office in the land, the Presidency.

Since Senator Kennedy succeeded in his ardent desire to become President, the Congress has received well over 60 messages—not one of which failed to request, or was accompanied by, proposed legislation which would result in Washington doing for the people what they should do for themselves, through local and private effort, with the exception, of course, of provision for our national defense.

It would be easy—and the temptation is great—to protect some of the illusions cherished by a portion of the American people, and lay at the door of the much-berated Presidential advisers, or even brother Bobby, the blame for many of these requests for legislation. However, the facts are that these messages to the Congress came directly from the President, were signed by him with his full knowledge of their content and implication, and he further has aggressively and consistently pressed for enactment of a major portion of these proposals.

All these legislative proposals were presumably geared to the President's repeatedly expressed wish to "move America ahead." And we all know now that without the Congress enacting even a smidgin of these proposals, we have indeed moved ahead—rapidly and inexorably—to the fantastic planned budget expenditures of $98,802 million for 1964—to the increase by 135,510 in Federal personnel since the change in administration in 1961—to the planned deficit of $11,902 million for 1964—and thence to an estimated national debt of $315,604 million which will extend much further than 1964. And all this without a determination and inclusion of the actual total cost of additional Federal aid to education, additional Federal medical care for the aged, additional Federal assistance to urban areas, or even a successful trip to the moon.

We have also moved ahead—rapidly and inexorably—to the final culmination and humiliation of a Communist regime only 90 miles from our southeastern Atlantic coast. Not only is this Communist government completely equipped by the Soviet Union with arms and troops, supposedly for self-defense, but it likewise possesses the additional bonus of our diplomatic guarantee against invasion. This is now crowned by the promise of United Nations aid to agriculture for this Communist nation—indirectly financed by our own funds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to revise and extend my remarks and include with them an article written by Henry Hazlitt, entitled "The Fallacy of Too Much Planning," which appeared in the Reader's Digest of February 1963 as a condensed version of the original article in Newsweek of September 24, 1962. This article expresses some well-known truths, which we as a Nation should be willing to face, lest we find ourselves—God forbid—at the point of no return:

THE FALLACY OF TOO MUCH PLANNING

(By Henry Hazlitt)

"The welfare state is the great fiction where everybody tries to live at the expense of everybody else."

The idea of Government economic planning appeals to many intellectuals and politicians today. What they forget is that each of us, in his private capacity, is constantly planning ahead—regarding his job, his business, his leisure, his spending, his saving for a home or a car or the education of his children. These millions of individual plans are coordinated through the marvelous mechanism of competition and the free market.

The question then is never whether there should be planning or not, but who should plan for whom? To put it another way, the question is whether each of us should be free to make his own plans, or whether all of us should be forced to work or consume according to some master plan drawn up for us by some supposed group of supermen.

While most plans being proposed today are plans for accelerating economic growth, there are also, under the influence of J. K. Galbraith, plans to control our spending. According to the Galbraith thesis, most consumers do not know how to spend the incomes they have earned. They have atrocious taste, and they waste their money on trivialities and junk.

The natural conclusion is that the consumers should be supplied not with what they themselves want, but with what Government bureaucrats, full of wisdom, think is good for them. And the way to do this is to tax away from people all the income they have been earning over that required to meet their bare necessities and turn it over to the bureaucrats to be spent in ways they think would really do people the most good.

The goods and services for which people voluntarily spend their own money make up, in the Galbraithian vocabularly, the "private sector" of the economy, while the goods and services supplied to them by the Government, out of the income seized from them in taxes, make up the "public sector." This is a neat semantic triumph, for the word "private" is meant to suggest the selfish and exclusive, while the word "public" is meant to suggest the democratic, the shared, the public spirited.

Actually, what Galbraith calls the "private sector" of the economy is in fact the voluntary sector; and what he calls the "public sector" is in fact the coercive sector. And as this sector grows at the expense of the voluntary sector, we come to the essence of the welfare state.

In this state nobody pays for the education of his own children, but everybody pays for the education of everybody else's children. Nobody pays his own medical bills, but everybody pays everybody else's medical bills. Nobody helps his own old parents, but everybody helps everybody else's old parents. Nobody provides for the contingency of his own unemployment, his own sickness, his own old age, but everybody provides for the contingency of the unemployment, sickness or old age of everybody else. The welfare state, as the French political economist Claude Frédéric Bastiat put it with uncanny clairvoyance more than a century ago, is the great fiction by which everybody tries to live at the expense of everybody else.

This is not only a fiction; it is bound to be a failure. This is sure to be the outcome whenever effort is separated from reward. When people who can earn more than the average have the "surplus" seized from them in taxes, and when people who earn

less than the average have the deficiency turned over to them in handouts, the production of everybody must decline; for the energetic and able lose their incentive to produce more than the average, and the slothful and unskilled lose their incentive to improve their condition.

THERE'S NO STOPPING REA—OR IS THERE?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, last year the Agriculture Committee held extensive hearings on several aspects of the farm program—including rural electrification. The resulting committee report on the farm bill—House Report No. 1691—pointed out that:

> Testimony revealed a growing public concern over the failure of the REA to disclose information on various phases of its operations.

The report went on to say:

> The public is entitled to know how public funds are being used.

All of us here in this Chamber were reminded also that:

> Congress, of course, is charged with the responsibility of assuring that public funds are handled in accordance with the original intent of the Rural Electrification Act.

Mr. Speaker, the public concern about the extent to which REA has gone beyond that original intent of Congress is apparently continuing unabated. As a case in point, I call attention to a very interesting and revealing article in the current issue of Fortune magazine entitled, "There's No Stopping REA—Or Is There?" This article documents the fact that despite assurances to the contrary given by one of the fathers of the REA Act—the late Sam Rayburn—REA-financed cooperatives are now increasingly engaged in aggressive competition with investor-owned electric power companies and are on "an empire-building kick that is invading urban territories, wooing industrial customers, and threatening to consolidate into a gigantic national electric system, federally subsidized and tax free."

The writer of this article asks a rhetorical question which I think each of us should ask ourselves. He asks, "Is there a way that REA co-ops can cut the silver cord of dependence on governmental paternalism and become in truth the 'independent business enterprises' that REA now calls them?" The author suggests one possible method of accomplishing this worthwhile goal, but I am sure there are many others that deserve our attention.

However, because Congress is charged with the responsibility of assuring that public funds are handled in accordance with the original intent of the Rural Electrification Act, I believe every one of us should read and study this Fortune article. It seems to me to be an honest and fair appraisal of a serious problem which sorely needs congressional attention.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the Fortune article in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the reading of every Member of Congress:

THERE'S NO STOPPING THE REA—OR IS THERE?

(By Hubert Kay)

There had never been anything like it on the lonely ranch in the red sandhill country of southeastern New Mexico, and almost certainly there would never be anything like it again. For all the 21 years of their married life, John and Margaret McGuffin had lived unnoticed and cut off from the world without electricity or telephone, 3½ miles from their nearest neighbor and more than 30 miles from the nearest town, Tatum, in Lea County. Then, on the morning of last July 2, strange and wonderful things began to happen.

A car drove up and out stepped the head of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Electrification Administration, Norman Clapp, a big man with several hundred million dollars a year to lend, come all the way from Washington. Up from Lovington, N. Mex., drove the manager of Lea County's rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives, which with money borrowed from REA had just built 3½ miles of poles and lines to the McGuffin ranchhouse. A new dial telephone rang for the first time, and Mr. McGuffin was summoned to talk with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, calling from Washington. After a little speech by Administrator Clapp and a ceremony of turning out the kerosene lamps, electric current came surging over the new line to lighten the lives of the McGuffins and make their ranch the 5 millionth consumer to receive REA-financed electric service.

In this carefully staged but still heartwarming little drama, REA once again presented itself in its long-admired role as the great light bringer to rural America. But behind this image a new reality has developed, troubling the agency's congressional friends and alarming the U.S. electric-utility industry. The co-ops, financed by REA, have grown into a nationwide, $4 billion electric group increasingly engaged in aggressive, Government-subsidized competition with investor-owned electric companies. Five out of six of the co-ops' new member customers in recent years have been industrial, commercial, and nonfarm residential consumers.

The co-ops are not about to take over the industry. On their 1½ million miles of REA-financed lines they still average only about 3.3 consumers per mile, one-tenth the number for major power companies. The trend from farm to city has left the co-ops with some 500,000 abandoned services (i.e., lines built to serve individual residences) representing an investment of many millions on which they receive no return. But these predictable handicaps are more than offset by recent co-op developments, based on long-standing advantages. Once almost wholly dependent on purchased power, the co-ops are surging toward independence with more and more power plants of their own. They are exempt from Federal taxation and from much State and local taxation. They are financed at 2 percent interest with funds for which the Government pays about 4 percent. They share first call on the cheap hydroelectric power generated at Federal dams. They are now selling more than half their power to nonfarm buyers. Having clearly outrun the intentions of REA's congressional founders, they constitute a growing threat both to American principles of private enterprise and to the gigantic private investment in the U.S. electric-utility industry.

New Jersey's Senator CLIFFORD CASE, whose State has only one small REA co-op, got a jolting introduction to what all this means in practical terms when a New York City industrial consultant named David T. Kleinman called at his Washington office one day last spring. Dr. Kleinman represented a client who had been planning to build a tape factory in Paterson, N.J. With him he had a letter received from an REA co-op in Pennsylvania. Said the letter: If the Kleinman client would agree to build his factory in the co-op's territory, contract to buy its power, and put up $50,000 of its own, the co-op would lend him $450,000 for the purchase of his factory's electrical machinery and equipment. To the Senator from New Jersey, a liberal Republican not easily unnerved by governmental forays into business areas, this attempt to lure a prospective new industry from his State seemed a most curious diversion of the subsidized rural light.

THIRTY-FIVE-YEAR LOANS

Senator CASE promptly joined a growing group of congressional members who have decided to do battle with the image of the "light bringer" in order to come to grips with the realities. It is a powerful image. When REA was founded in 1935, nearly 9 out of 10 American farms still lacked the electricity that had become commonplace in the Nation's towns and cities. Thanks largely to REA—to the systems it financed and to the stimulus they gave to rural expansion by investor-owned electric companies—some 98 percent of the Nation's farms are now electrified. Even power company executives concede that in fulfilling its original purpose REA performed a national service. Countless rural people remember gratefully the coming of REA lines to their farms, not merely bringing them electric current but bringing them into the main current of American life. Millions of Americans have a vested interest in the continued existence of the 991 independent, locally run cooperatives, and the scattering of other electric systems, that REA has financed with more than $4 billion of Federal funds and is continuing to finance at a rate of $400 million a year.

The political momentum developed by all this has long kept REA a congressional sacred cow. Yet House and Senate agricultural committees and agricultural appropriations subcommittees, where legislative limitations on REA's powers and purse must begin, were openly critical of some of the Agency's practices last year and seem ready to take some action in this session.

One choice is beyond the power of Congress to make. It cannot, by inaction, maintain the status quo. REA partisans stress that its program is self-liquidating. The excellent REA repayment record indicates that this is true—as far as it goes. But co-op loads (i.e., consumer demands) are doubling every 5 to 10 years. Heavier loads require a costly process of physical "heavying up"—the installation of heavier lines and poles—and a far costlier increase in generating capacity. Few co-ops can finance such capital investment out of earnings. Hence a co-op that gets a $20 million generating loan today will almost certainly be back within 10 years for another $20 million loan, and in 20 years for a loan of $40 million. Since the co-ops have 35 years to repay their loans, they will—except as they pay for expansion with their own money—be borrowing from the Government three to four times faster than they repay. Until Congress takes some action, the co-ops' Government-subsidized competition with private enterprise, and the cost of their subsidies to taxpayers, will continue to mount in near arithmetic progression.

The harsh battle between partisans of REA and of the electric utility industry is marked by flat contradictions of fact, passionate charges, and countercharges. In the main, both sides have simply reacted in pre-

dictable ways to an unpredicted change in American life since World War II: the revolution of exploding cities and industries and shrinking farmland.

Thanks to a technological revolution in which electrification has been a major element, the Nation's farmers each year produce bigger and bigger crops on fewer and fewer acres. In the past decade U.S. farmland has been withdrawn from crop production at an average rate of 4 million acres a year. Meanwhile, riding technological and population booms of their own, cities and industries have burst out into the countryside, covering former farmlands with suburbs, housing developments, factories. Inevitably, and on an ever-increasing scale, electric co-ops and companies have met and clashed in border warfare unforeseen by REA's founders in the depression world of the mid-1930's.

WE ARE NOT INTENDING TO COMPETE WITH ANYBODY

The Rural Electrification Administration was created by Franklin D. Roosevelt's Executive order on May 11, 1935, and allotted $100 million of work relief funds. As a quick jobmaker, the new agency could not compete with leaf raking; too much of its funds had to go for heavy equipment. But friends of the farmer and of public power saw their opportunity. The greatest of them, Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, moved to seize it. Another hardscrabble farm boy, Sam Rayburn, of Texas, then chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, joined him in introducing a bill to authorize a 10-year REA program openly designed both to fight the depression and to raise rural living standards.

It would have been ridiculous to build electric distribution lines in rural areas and deny service to villagers or to stores, machine shops, feed mills, grain elevators, and other rural businesses. Hence the Norris-Rayburn bill did not specify farms or farmers. Instead it authorized REA to make loans "for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service." A rural area was defined as one "not included within the boundaries of any city, village, or borough having a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants." The bill specifically authorized the agency to make loans for generating plants and also, in its now much discussed section 5, to lend money to REA borrowers, which they in turn could lend to their customers for the purchase of electrical and plumbing equipment. The U.S. farm depression had been going on since the collapse of the World War I boom in 1920; it was reasonable to assume that the rural electrification program would never get off the ground unless farmers were helped to both electricity and equipment.

Members of Congress concerned about possible competition with existing private enterprise were reassured by the bill's distinguished sponsors. "May I say to the gentleman," said Sam Rayburn in response to a question, "that we are not, in this bill, intending to go out and compete with anybody." Senator Norris inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum from the first REA Administrator, Morris L. Cooke:

"REA can make loans for generating plants but we must be shown conclusively (1) that energy is not available from any existing source, (2) that the proposed generating plant can produce energy at a lower cost than it could be obtained from any other source, (3) that the output of such plants will be used mainly for supplying energy for use in rural areas."

With these assurances the Norris-Rayburn bill became the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

As Administrator Cooke had indicated, REA co-ops at first devoted themselves almost wholly to building low-voltage distribution lines; over these anyone who paid a membership fee of $5 or $10 could get power, bought mainly from private companies. In the first 5 years only about 2.5 percent of REA loans were for the building of generating plants and their accompanying high-voltage transmission lines. Expansion slowed during World War II. But when the wartime scarcity of materials ended, a new world began to open up for ambitious men in REA and the co-ops. In the postwar boom, farm consumption of electricity soared with the accelerated trend toward consolidation of small family units into big mechanized factory farms. The rapid expansion of cities and industries further encouraged co-op dreams of growth and independence. A responsive Congress jumped its annual REA appropriation from $25 million in 1945 to $300 million in 1946. In 1950, after Congress had assigned REA the additional and noncontroversial task of making loans for rural telephone expansion, the annual appropriation reached $495 million. Also, by 1950, of all REA loans 16.4 percent had gone for generating and transmission facilities.

Three months after taking office, President Kennedy's REA Administrator, Norman Clapp, announced a new "third criterion" for G. & T. loans. Hereafter, he decreed, they would no longer be limited to co-ops that had no other adequate and dependable source of power, or that could generate power more cheaply than they could buy it. Instead, they would also be granted wherever "necessary to protect the security and effectiveness of REA-financed systems." REA's nervous critics suspected that their worst fears had come to be personified in the new management, for the new third criterion seemed broad enough to cover almost any G. & T. loan that Clapp and his colleagues might care to make.

AN ELECTRIFIED WORLD OF BLACK AND WHITE

A stocky, articulate man who suggests a crewcut William Jennings Bryan, Norman Clapp arrived at his present post by way of experience as a Wisconsin weekly newspaper publisher, and as a three-time loser in campaigns for Congress. He is also a brother of Gordon Clapp, onetime TVA Chairman. On the evidence of his own words, Administrator Clapp, 48, appears—like Bryan—to live in a world of black and white. When a co-op last year finally brought electric service to John McGuffin's New Mexico ranch, 11 years after McGuffin had applied for it, Clapp hailed the event as one more triumph of "individual initiative to which are added the qualities of good neighborliness and basic Christianity wrapped up in good, practical, operating American democracy." But when the Nevada Power Co. last year finally brought electric service to a desert valley where a new co-op was in the planning stage, Clapp denounced the event as one more example of "the selfishness, cynicism, and greed that have characterized the opposition of the power companies to the rural electrification program all these years—and that still do." (Power companies, which had electrified 750,000 farms by 1936, now serve 43 percent of U.S. farms.) At the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's regional meetings last fall, Clapp squared off against his (and Bryan's) personal devil: "The power companies are not alone in their opposition to the REA programs. If the battle for rural electrification is to be won, we must recognize our opposition for what it is. It is perfectly plain that this opposition springs from big business and its political allies. These are the culprits who are trying to hang the Socialist smear tag on you."

The adviser, ally, and goad of REA Administrators since 1943—and the gadfly of power companies and Members of Congress who dare to oppose his wishes—is a redoubtable former Congressman from Arkansas named Clyde Ellis, 54, general manager of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association since its founding and sometimes called the man who runs REA from outside. Starting from scratch, Ellis has built National Rural Electric Cooperative Association into a co-op service organization (purchasing, insurance, managerial training) with a $1 million Washington building of its own. But he is still best known as a formidable lobbyist and arm-pumping speechmaker. At a Western States water and power consumers conference in Portland, Oreg., last October, according to the Portland Oregonian, he declared of the Nation's power companies: "Their object is to take over the Government. They are public enemy No. 1—more dangerous than Communists because Communists are not a threat, but dictatorship is a threat."

Ellis promptly wrote to the Oregonian to correct its "inadvertent misquote" of his extemporaneous remarks, explaining: "I feel that the commercial electric utilities are the No. 1 threat from within to our free enterprise system. They are more dangerous even than Communists who no longer are considered a substantial threat from within." Short, bald, tightlipped, and intense, Ellis started his career as an Arkansas State legislator feuding with the State's political boss who was also president of its largest power company. His associates scoff at the frequent charge that his ultimate goal is nationalization of the U.S. electric-utility industry. "Actually," says one, "Mr. Ellis is a very conservative man who just hates the power companies."

Two or three steps behind Clapp and Ellis, somewhat less in the limelight, stands Kenneth Holum, 47, a tall, rugged, farmer-politician from Aberdeen, S. Dak. Holum, a veteran of the public power expansion wars in the Missouri River Basin, is President Kennedy's Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power—and as such the man in charge of the power produced by the giant Federal dams. To understand Holum's connection with REA ambitions we must first understand the full potential of REA's own plans.

THE BATTLE FOR TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

The Clapp-Ellis REA war cry is "territorial integrity." Since duplication of costly electric facilities is clearly wasteful, regulatory commissions and neighboring U.S. power companies long ago arrived at a system of exclusive company territories with firm no-trespassing agreements. Private power companies map their territorial boundaries as sharply as counties, reserving territory not only for each company's existing service but also for its future development. REA partisans have convinced themselves and are trying hard to convince State legislatures that, without paying the price in taxes, interest, and—usually—in State regulation, co-ops nonetheless deserve all of the territorial and other privileges of ordinary utility companies.

Administrator Clapp frankly concedes that many co-op territories are now more or less urbanized. But despite the provisions of the 1936 act limiting REA to "rural areas," he insists that any territory a co-op "developed in good faith" when it was rural still belongs to that co-op, no matter how urban the area may have become.

When a co-op service area has been legally annexed by a city in which a power company holds a franchise, the co-op has sometimes sold its facilities to the company or exchanged them for some of the company's rural lines. Some co-ops and companies have reached territorial or nonduplication agreements, and some even pool their power for mutual benefit. But border warfare is widespread; the two fight it out customer by customer, often duplicating each other's lines. Any co-op battling for more nonfarm business in its service area may be

certain that Messrs. Clapp and Ellis will back it to the limit.

Though company rates are in general slightly lower than those of the co-ops, the co-ops have some distinct advantages in such competition. Among them:

As a legal monopoly strictly regulated by State and Federal commissions, a power company can neither raise its rates at will to increase profit nor arbitrarily lower them for a particular customer to underbid a competitor. Its Commission-set rates allow it a fixed percentage of profit, based on its gross income, capital investment, and allowable operating costs. Discrimination among customers of the same class normally is forbidden; if a company voluntarily lowers its rates for one customer it must give the same reduction to all others in the class.[1] Co-ops, however, are partially or wholly exempt from Commission regulation in most States. Most co-ops, therefore, are legally free to set any rates they please.

Capital investment in the electric utility industry is heavy: an average of nearly $4.50 of total plant per dollar of annual revenue as compared with an average of about $2.15 for manufacturing industries. Hence power companies are heavy borrowers, currently at 4 to 5 percent interest. Co-ops get their Federal funds at 2 percent and may defer principal payments during the first 5 years of the loan's 35-year term.

Taxes and capital charges take about 40 percent of the power companies' gross revenues. Of every dollar received from their customers, about 24 cents goes out in taxes, including 13 cents in Federal income taxes. Like other U.S. industries, power companies get the benefit of tax deferrals for accelerated amortization and depreciation, giving them temporary interest-free use of substantial amounts collected for taxes. But as nonprofit organizations, the co-ops pay no direct Federal taxes whatever, and less than normal State and local taxes.

Co-ops get many services from REA, but pay nothing toward the $10-million-a-year cost of administering the agency.

As preferred customers, many co-ops buy power from the hydroelectric installations at Federal multipurpose dams. Because these dams share the co-ops' freedom from taxes and because they can charge off much of their operating expense to navigation, irrigation, flood control, recreation, and other purposes, these Federal business enterprises can and do sell electricity for little more than half the price of commercial power. The Edison Electric Institute has calculated that if TVA were to pay a power company's rates of taxes and interest, it would have to raise its selling rates by 56 percent.

A COLD EYE FOR SNOW MAKING

The Government gives the co-ops one small additional competitive advantage: the lure of the section 5 loan. These loans are fiscal peanuts ($2 to $5 million a year) but political hot potatoes. Washington provides funds at the usual 2 percent interest and the co-op relends them at its own rates. As long as the loans were made for the purchase of home wiring and appliances, and electrical farm equipment, they were not challenged. But now section 5 money is being used increasingly to build up co-op business with industrial customers. Recent section 5 loans have gone to a gravel-crushing plant in North Dakota, lumber companies in Minnesota and Idaho, a textile mill in North Carolina. To its critics in and out of Congress, REA seemed to have got about as far as possible from its original purposes when it announced early last year that it had provided an Illinois co-op with $30,000 to lend to a ski resort for the purchase of snow-making equipment and outdoor lights.

Concerning this and other section 5 loans, Administrator Clapp got a sharp warning from the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, during hearings on last year's farm bill: "I think you should be very careful not to make loans that are going to go so far afield, because the first thing you know we will have to rewrite that section and make it perfectly clear that we did not intend that. And if you continue to industrialize, we will certainly do that."

THE SPECTER OF NATIONALIZATION

If the various inequities of competition were all that mattered to the executives of investor-owned power companies, they might secretly enjoy the fight with REA just for providing some excitement in an industry from which competition and risk have largely vanished. But the power industry is haunted by something far more somber—the specter of nationalization. The specter is taking shape and substance as co-op generating plants increasingly become key links in what could ultimately form a gigantic national electric system, partly Government owned, partly Government subsidized, and all largely tax exempt. Against such a system, a private industry that pays out almost 40 percent of its revenues in taxes and capital charges could not compete.

Hydroelectric generators at Federal dams could not alone power such a system. Their supply of falling water and hence their electric output vary with rainfall and the seasons, and also with the needs of navigation, irrigation, flood control, municipal water supply, and recreation, which have been the ostensible primary purposes of this huge, still growing Federal investment (over $5 billion for power facilities alone). To become a dependable source of electricity in season and out, the output of hydrogenerators must be supplemented or firmed up by the fuel-burning generators, generally called thermal or steamplants, that produce most U.S. commercial electricity.

Except in the special case of TVA, Congress had steadfastly refused to let Federal dam authorities build steamplants. Electricity has in principle been merely a byproduct that helps pay for the dams' other services.

Congress does not, however, set any limit to the percentage of REA funds that may be loaned for co-op generating plants. An amendment to limit G. & T. loans, introduced by Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois, a Republican, was voted down by the House last year, 133 to 94. And the rise in G. & T. loans has been accompanied by an increasing trend toward firm up tie-ins between REA steamplants and Federal hydrogenerators.

Such tie-ins or pooling are normally beneficial to both parties. Power consumption varies not only from hour to hour but also with the weather and seasons. A producer's average demand may be only half of its peak demand. By exchanging power, producers with differing peaks can dispense with much of their costly reserve capacity. But because of the REA drive for nonfarm business, every tie-in between a G. & T. co-op and a Federal dam puts the U.S. Government more directly and openly into competition with private enterprise.

The specter assumes special proportions because REA loans for the construction of co-op generating systems are shrouded in secrecy. G. & T. loans are normally made to federations of distribution co-ops, formed to build or expand a G. & T. supercooperative. In the early years, when co-ops thought they were being overcharged by a private power supplier, they would make engineering studies of the cost of generating their own power, and submit their figures to the supplier. The result was often a substantial reduction in the supplier's rates. Employed thus, the threat of a G. & T. loan was an effective and legitimate bargaining weapon.

But as REA and the co-ops grew in ambition and political power, the public and Congress learned less and less about G. & T. loan applications. Every G. & T. loan means a loss of tax revenues and interest to the Government and its taxpayers, and a loss of business to the power supplier who will be supplanted by it. Co-ops are still supposed to get their supplier's best offer before applying for a G. & T. loan. But, unless the co-op permits, neither power companies nor Members of Congress are allowed to examine the engineering studies that support G. & T. application claims. The REA Administrator can thus be the sole judge and jury of whether the applicants actually have no other adequate and dependable source of power, of whether they can really generate power for less than it would cost them to buy it, and—under the new third criterion—of whether their security and effectiveness are being impaired by a hostile supplier.

President Kennedy has called repeatedly for increased public power development, and urged more G. & T. loans. Near Pierre, S. Dak., last August, at the dedication of the sixth (Oahe) of seven great Federal dams on the upper Missouri River, the President called REA co-ops "a happy middle ground between private enterprise and public cooperation" and declared that "the role of REA isn't finished." And in this same Upper Missouri Basin last year the alliance between REA and Federal power came fully into the open.

MISSOURI ALLIANCE

In the northwestern tier of States ranging from western Minnesota and Iowa to Montana, co-ops buying much of their power from Federal dams on the Missouri were notified not long ago that after 1965 this Federal system—run by the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation—could no longer supply enough power for their growing needs. How and by whom should the additional power be produced? The Federal Government was shortly confronted by a basic choice. One way pointed toward the possible nationalization threatened by the tie-in of Federal hydro and co-op steamplant generation. The other way pointed toward what Secretary of the Interior Udall calls "cooperative competition" between private and public power.

The first alternative would require REA to make a big G. & T. loan to a group on co-ops. Power companies thought they saw a blueprint for the kind of creeping nationalization they fear when a detailed plan for a joint REA-Bureau of Reclamation development in the region appeared in July 1960. It was prepared and published by an organization called the Midwest Electric Consumers' Association. As the first step in the plan, it proposed that a 200,000-kilowatt co-op generating plant "should be built and on the line by 1965" and that it "should be installed on a site near Garrison Dam [North Dakota] * * * within approximately 13 miles of the Garrison [Bureau of Reclamation] substation." Two rival groups of the region's co-ops, calling themselves respectively Basin and Lignite, formed to seek the G & T loan.

The second alternative was presented to the Interior Department early last year by a group of 14 of the region's power producers. The group offered to firm up the Federal hydro system's power, and thereby increase it by half, without requiring the Govern-

[1] Commissions have long permitted the companies to sell power to co-ops at special low rates or discounts off their standard wholesale rates. But the Southwestern Public Service Co., operating in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico, was challenged by the Federal Power Commission last year for possible discrimination against its other wholesale customers by granting too low a rate to a group of co-ops.

ment to spend or lend a single dollar for new generating plants and transmission lines.

This seemed an ideal solution. Power consumption in this area—down in summer, up in winter—is the seasonal opposite of hydroelectric production. The 14-producer group offered to make up the Federal system's winter deficit in exchange for its summer surplus, with money changing hands only in exceptional circumstances. Between them, the group members already had 42 interconnections with the Federal lines. In addition to 12 power companies, the group included the Omaha Public Power District (no private power companies are left in George Norris' Nebraska) and the biggest G. & T. co-op, Wisconsin's Dairyland Power Cooperative. In this connection it should be firmly noted that many midwestern and western municipal power companies and REA co-ops find Washington control just as repugnant as private power companies do, and are, in fact, as fiercely individualistic as any Wall Street banking house.

On May 3, 1962, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall rejected the 14-producer offer. He announced that he had decided to deal instead with the Basin Electric Power Cooperative of Bismarck, N. Dak. Seven days later REA announced a $36,600,000 G. & T. loan to the Basin Co-op.

The bitterness of the rejected 14-producer group was easily matched by that of the rejected Lignite Co-op group. Both groups interpreted the decision as a move toward greater federalization of electric power. Evidence of Administrator Clapp's open alliance with the Bureau of Reclamation appeared in the five special stipulations that he had laid down for the G. & T. loan. One was that the group receiving it must agree in advance to use the Bureau's transmission system. The Bureau, in turn, would not permit use of its lines unless the Co-op group agreed to sell it power on its own terms, which the Lignite group considered unfair.

"The Basin people have sincere convictions," says a Lignite spokesman, "but we don't see things their way. We want to run our own business, not have it run by the Federal Government. Of course, if you want to argue about the way we borrow our money, that's all right. But we do borrow it and we pay it back and we do a job, and the Bureau of Reclamation doesn't tell us how to do it. That's why we feel we're more a private-enterprise-type business than a public-power type, and we want to keep it that way."

The Basin manager, James L. Grahl, former assistaant general manager of the American Public Power Association, makes no secret of the fact that Basin's is only the first of many generating plants that will be needed to supply the region's Co-op customers and firm up the Federal hydropower. And just as the blueprint of the Midwest Electric Consumers' Association predicted, the first 200,000-kilowatt Basin generating plant will be "on the line" precisely by late 1965 and, sure enough, it will be located on a site near Garrison Dam, within approximately 13 miles of the U.S.' Bureau of Reclamation's Garrison substation.

The skeptics add one more funny coincidence to this pattern. In its original publication, the Midwest association's executive director was listed as none other than Ken Holum, the same who is now Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power. "Ken Holum," says an acquaintance, "is a man who had a dream and then got in a position to make it come true."

If Holum and Clapp retain their present positions and Congress does not intervene, it seems highly probable that, sometime in 1963 or 1964, REA will announce something similar to the second step in the Midwest association's blueprint for the Missouri Basin. That calls for another 200,000-kilowatt plant to be located "at Vermillion, S. Dak., or some location near the head of navigation so that coal can be delivered by barge. If nuclear-plant design is far enough advanced at this time, this could be a nuclear plant."

BANKS FOR ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES?

Clearly, the REA crisis must be resolved—but with fairness to both sides and to the Nation. It is inconceivable that Congress would today, at one stroke, deliberately create what the REA complex has in fact become; certainly the Congress of 1936 had no such intention. Nevertheless, REA co-ops exist and, like scrambled eggs, cannot summarily be returned to the state of nature. Created by the U.S. Government, they grew with government encouragement and assistance. They are not just poles and wire and generators. They are tens of thousands of dedicated people who over the years have put an enormous amount of work, much of it unpaid, into what they sincerely believe is a public service not only to their neighbors but to the Nation. They are by no means unanimous in their support of the policies of Norman Clapp, Clyde Ellis, and Kenneth Holum. But they take pride in their achievement, and feel strongly that they have earned its rewards.

Is there a way that REA co-ops can cut the silver cord of dependence on Government paternalism and become in truth the "independent business enterprises" that REA now calls them?

A model for REA co-op independence has been operating successfully for nearly 30 years. In June 1933, Congress authorized the Farm Credit Administration to organize 13 banks for cooperatives—12 district banks plus a central bank in Washington—to make loans to farm purchasing, marketing, and service co-ops. Until 1956 most of the banks' capital stock came from a Government revolving fund. Then it was decided that cooperatives should gradually acquire a larger amount of stock in the banks and eventually own them. As a result, Government capital has been reduced, from $150 million on January 1, 1956, to $94,800,000 on June 30, 1962.

In fiscal 1962 the co-op banks marketed six short-term issues, mostly to commercial banks, insurance companies, and other institutional investors, which brought $887 million at interest ranging from 2.95 to 3.2 percent. The co-op banks in turn loaned co operatives $860 million, at interest ranging from 4 to 5 percent for commodity loans and from 4¼ to 5½ percent for operating capital and facility loans. Cooperatives now own $67 million of the banks' stock. Patronage refunds distributed to the cooperatives in the form of stock in the banks has reduced their average effective interest to 3.06 percent. They also have a $17,500,000 share in the co-op banks' earned net worth of $105 million. Since 1933 cooperatives have borrowed a total of $11.6 billion from the co-op banks—nearly triple the total of REA loans.

Could REA be converted into a similar system of banks for electric cooperatives? Fortune put the question to a famous old firm of securities underwriters, with the following figures. In 1960, REA borrowers earned net margins (i.e., profits) totaling $87 million. The borrowers own general funds or reserves totaling $539 million. Deducting a generous 9 percent of total plant for operating reserves, this leaves $180 million in genuine surplus funds. If REA borrowers were to pool these funds, they could begin with more than the stock of the FCA banks for cooperatives. By 1962 repayments had brought REA borrowers an average 21 percent equity, worth about $800 million, in their systems.

It is the underwriters' opinion that such a system of banks for electric cooperatives would have no trouble in marketing long-term bonds. Like other untried issues, its first would probably have to pay an above-normal return, of perhaps 5 percent. Later issues should rank with the best utility bonds, currently paying interest of 4.2 to 4.4 percent, and the interest might well go lower. The REA banks could easily borrow all that the co-ops might need, beginning at $500 million a year and rising substantially. Present Government loans would be repaid at the agreed 2 percent, but REA's present first mortgages on its borrowers' facilities should be replaced by bonds holding equal rank with others to be issued.

To smooth the transition to independence, Congress might well lower the interest rate on the new banks' bonds by giving them a Government guarantee. If the need were demonstrated, it might also—as President Eisenhower suggested in his 1961 proposal for REA co-op financial independence—help start the new banks with a Federal loan. Other concessions would merit consideration. If, for example, Congress really does want to achieve the REA goal of "area coverage" by subsidizing electric service to every last country dweller in the land, it might create a special fund on which co-ops could draw for the purpose.

It would be left to each State to decide whether its independent electric co-ops should be subject to full commission regulation. But even without that, power companies might well grant the co-ops the same territorial recognition they now give each other—on one condition.

That condition would be that Congress eliminate the threat of nationalization by enacting the recommendations painstakingly made by its own advisory commission, the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission) in 1953–55. Charged with recommending ways of eliminating from the Government "nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise," the Commission put its expert task forces to work, concluded that REA should be transformed into "a self-supporting institution securing its own finance from private sources."

Concerning Federal electric power, the report continued: "The task force insists that if the Federal Government does engage in business activities normally conducted by private individuals, it should charge rates which recover at least the actual costs of conducting them.

"It also states that there is neither economic nor social reason, nor reason in equity, why all customers of Federal power should not pay in their rates their fair share of the costs of Federal, State, and local governments."

The Commission therefore recommended that Congress equalize private and public power rates—and competition—by requiring that Federal power be sold at rates which would amortize and pay interest on the Federal investment involved, and would include amounts equivalent to the Federal, State, and local taxes paid by private power companies.

A statute to that effect would banish the specter of nationalization.

OFF UNCLE SAM'S SORE BACK

The power needs of the United States, with its growing population and advancing technology, are boundless. There is plenty of room for both REA public power and private power systems, and for what Secretary Udall calls cooperative competition between them, if that competition is thus made fair.

With this position granted (and it does not sit well with either private or Government power purists), the next move, in spirit, must come from those independent-minded among the co-ops. Their very independent-mindedness might lead them to resist a pooling of their funds to free up the whole system; on the other hand, there are heartening

signs of a growing co-op determination to get free of Washington.

One notable challenger is a rugged individualist named Les Dumond, manager of the Northern Rio Arriba Electric Co-op, Inc., called NORA for short. Having refused to attend the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association national convention in Atlantic City last year, Manager Dumond let fly in his NORA Co-op News to explain his reasons. After detailing the impassioned demands and denunciations to be made at the convention, he continued:

"The governing board of this cooperative has gone on record repeatedly over the years to this effect:

" 'We believe wholeheartedly in the original concept of the rural electrification program. We are grateful for the fact that through it we have been able to bring good electric service to NORA country. It could not have been done any other way.

" 'We believe, just as wholeheartedly, that, as soon as possible, co-ops should start getting off Uncle Sam's sore back. With 90 percent of the co-ops, that was 5 years ago.' "

Manager Dumond's co-op headquarters are in Chama, N. Mex. about 300 miles as the crow flies, and immeasurably distant in spirit, from the "5,000,000th consumer" festivities at John and Margaret McGuffin's lonely ranch.

Mr. Speaker, we here in Congress must face up to this so-called REA problem. We cannot just close our eyes and hope it will go away, because it seems to be getting worse rather than better. During the hearings last year before the Agriculture Committee, the REA Administrator was cautioned about some of his current excesses, as in the case of section 5 loans for snow-making machinery—but he has continued to make such loans for commercial or industrial purposes. Congress created this program and Congress has the responsibility for establishing the policies to guide its future activities.

The President in his budget message this year again called for the establishment of an REA loan account, but as yet no legislation has been introduced to carry out this suggestion. If and when hearings are held on this subject in the 88th Congress, we may have the opportunity to clarify some of these other aspects of the program.

I have no desire to hurt the rural electric cooperatives, but I agree with the manager of the NORA cooperative in New Mexico who was quoted in the Fortune article as having said recently:

We believe that * * * co-ops should start getting off Uncle Sam's sore back.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN USDA SKYROCKETS — ASCS EMPLOYMENT GOING UP IN FISCAL YEAR 1964

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1963, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman spoke at the National Farm Institute in Des Moines, Iowa, about the number of employees in his Department.

This is a subject about which the Secretary should be most adept since he is adding employees at a faster rate than any of his predecessors. Yet, the press release issued by the Department of Agriculture last week covering the Secretary's Des Moines speech leaves the definite impression that the number of people working on farm programs is declining. This is not true. USDA press release 499–63 which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] inserted at page 2275 of the RECORD for February 14, 1963, reads as follows:

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today that employment in the Department's agency most directly concerned with farm programs is declining.

He told the Des Moines, Iowa, Farm Institute, meeting in its 25th session, that full-time Federal employment in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service has been reduced by nearly 600 persons in the past 2 years. He indicated the downward trend would continue.

ASCS is the Department agency which administers farm commodity programs in the field and supervises storage and disposal programs of Government-owned farm commodities. Total employment in the agency at the beginning of this year was 7,071 as compared to 7,646 at the beginning of 1961.

This reduction in personnel as of January has come about not because there is less to do, but because we are finding more efficient ways to do more work with fewer people in the administration of farm programs and in the handling of commodity stocks.

The Secretary said he was citing the ASCS example to correct a growing public misconception that Department employment grows while the number of persons employed in agriculture continue to decline.

I want to make it clear that the number of USDA personnel is increasing, but the increase is coming in those areas and programs where increased demands are being made for services which benefit all 186 million American citizens.

It is interesting that the Secretary should base his whole case on USDA employment on the ASCS situation. Using the Secretary's own figures and using the dates he cites, there may well be a decline of 575 jobs on paper from early 1961 to early 1963. But what about the situation now and what about the request for jobs for the forthcoming fiscal year—1964?

In this regard, I draw the attention of the House to the personnel summary for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—ASCS—which appears at page 124 of the appendix to the budget for fiscal year 1964. In the category of "average number of all employees" for fiscal year 1964, you will find the figure 7,912. Their average grade will be a GS–7, and their average annual salary will be $6,767.

Thus, it can be seen from the official budget figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture itself that the number of employees in ASCS will not be 575 less than at the beginning of 1961. There will, in fact, be 266 more people there than at the beginning of 1961 and 841 more people than at the beginning of 1963.

The Secretary's juggling act with employment numbers falls completely flat when we see that there was a decline in total USDA employment in 1959 and again in 1960 which was followed by increases in 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964. By adding 19,026 people in the 3-year period from June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, Mr. Freeman could man a full U.S. Army division.

To document my statement, I refer to the figures which Dr. Walter Wilcox, senior agricultural specialist at the Library of Congress, obtained from the Department of Agriculture and which I inserted into the RECORD at page 1860 on February 4, 1963. I ask unanimous consent to include this data on USDA employment for fiscal years 1933 to 1964 at this point in the RECORD.

Number of employees in the Department of Agriculture, fiscal years 1933 to 1964 (estimated)[1]

Fiscal year:	
1933	[2] 33,233
1934	[2] 54,208
1935	[2] 85,114
1936	[2] 82,302
1937	[2] 80,125
1938	[2] 84,031
1939	[2] 86,250
1940	[2] 81,886
1941	[3] 90,169
1942	[3] 91,141
1943	[3] 104,510
1944	77,720
1945	81,984
1946	96,590
1947	87,483
1948	82,134
1949	86,247
1950	84,097
1951	81,350
1952	78,559
1953	78,404
1954	76,276
1955	85,503
1956	89,398
1957	95,998
1958	101,139
1959	97,220
1960	98,694
1961	102,557
1962	[4] 110,511
1963	[4] 116,268
1964	[4] 121,583

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census. "Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1938–62."
[2] Employment figures for December.
[3] U.S. Department of Agriculture.
[4] U.S. Budget, 1964. Washington, 1963, p. 422.

Mr. Speaker, everybody recognizes that the Department of Agriculture performs a variety of services for our whole population, but as a member of the legislative committee, I cannot recall considering legislation which would add 19,026 people to the Federal payroll. Let us just remember one thing—our farm population is declining. It has been for some time, and it is continuing to do so under Mr. Freeman. In the past 10 years—from 1950 to 1960—it declined 41.3 percent. In the same period, it has declined 27.3 percent in my home State of Iowa. We have lost another congressional seat because of this decline. Mr. Freeman certainly cannot convince me that he needs 5,215 more people next year, and I doubt very much that he will be able to convince the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress either.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING SERVICE-INCURRED DISABILITY OF DEAFNESS OF BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 38 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1963, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the disposal of agricultural surpluses pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements upon United States agriculture;

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954;

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies;

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers;

(5) The formulation and development of improved price support and regulatory programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities;

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees;

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended; and the development of land use programs pursuant to titles I and IV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962: *Provided,* That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, or outside the United States by subcommittee of not to exceed five members, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at any time during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 11, delete the words "or outside the United States by subcommittees of not to exceed five members,".

On page 4, after line 4, add the following paragraph:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Agriculture for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for investigatory authority for the Committee on Agriculture. I was prepared to call it up when we had the large number of resolutions here earlier in the session. However, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], asked me to hold it off. I am now informed by the clerk of the committee that the gentleman from North Carolina would now like to proceed with it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is in the same form as the resolutions for other committees of the House; that is, it has an amendment with a restriction on the use of foreign currencies and does not give the committee authority to travel abroad.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1963

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

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

There was no objection.

THE OVERALL BUDGET PICTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittees of our Appropriations Committee are meeting daily poring over the volumes of justifications, listening to and interrogating departmental witnesses.

From time to time I shall be expressing myself on this critical issue of Federal spending in more specifics, but at this time I should like to make some general observations on the overall budget picture.

The President has submitted a budget for fiscal year 1964 which anticipates that expenditures can be held below $100 billion and the deficit below $12 billion. Despite the monumental nature of these figures, there is still room for serious doubt that either expenditures or the deficit can be held down to the estimates.

EXPENDITURES

Uncertainties as to the validity of the expenditure estimates arise in at least three areas:

First. Whether certain anticipated reductions in expenditures will actually occur. The budget estimates are premised on the assumption that substantial expenditure reductions can be made within the categories of agricultural and international affairs and lesser reductions in housing and veterans' affairs.

Agriculture: The fiscal year 1964 budget assumes that expenditures for agricultural programs can be cut a billion dollars below fiscal year 1963 expenditures. One basic reason for skepticism lies in the fact that last year's budget also estimated that fiscal year 1963 expenditures for agriculture could be cut—by $500 million below fiscal year 1962. Instead, they are now expected to be nearly 1 billion higher than in fiscal year 1962. There seems little assurance that this year's program will fare any better.

International: The new budget assumes that the activities of the Export-Import Bank will result in a net inflow

of funds to the Treasury of approximately $650 million on top of a comparable inflow of $225 million in the current year. Whether disinvestment of this magnitude will be achieved at a time when such studies attention is being paid to increasing U.S. exports seems unlikely.

Housing: Expenditures for housing programs are projected to fall by $250 million, largely on the premise that the category "aids to private housing" will provide net receipts for the Government of $437 million, a figure substantially larger than comparable receipts in any year in the preceding decade.

Veterans: For the second year in a row expenditures on veterans' programs are projected to decrease. However, revised fiscal year 1963 figures for the Veterans' Administration now indicate that expenditures for fiscal year 1963 will be more rather than less than those for fiscal year 1962. Additional basis for skepticism as to the possibility of a reduction in fiscal year 1964 veterans' expenditures derives from the fact that expenditures for veterans' programs have fallen in only 2 years in the past decade and never by more than a third of the drop predicted for fiscal year 1964.

Of particular significance is the fact that in three of the above four areas, the projected expenditure cuts are based primarily on the assumption of positive actions by the business community, that is, net purchase from the Government of well over $1 billion worth of CCC cotton, HHFA mortgages, and Exim Bank paper. If expenditures fail to fall as indicated, the business community can be blamed for lack of cooperation, just as it failed this year to live up to its potential and to help produce the gross national product and the corporate profits on which the initial estimates of the fiscal year 1963 budget surplus were premised.

Second. Whether certain supplemental expenditures can be made in fiscal year 1963. In the 2-month period between November 1962 and January 1963 estimates as to required fiscal year 1963 supplemental appropriations jumped $1.1 billion and anticipated fiscal year 1963 expenditures $624 million. For example, it is now proposed to ask Congress for an additional $500 million in appropriations for the accelerated public works program and to expend more than $100 million of these moneys before June 30, 1963. It is entirely possible that certain of these new expenditures are shown for fiscal year 1963 in order to provide a better picture in fiscal year 1964; to the extent, of course, that accelerated programs of this nature do not result in actual spending before the end fiscal year 1963. Fiscal year 1964 expenditures will rise commensurately.

Third. Whether the fiscal year 1964 budget makes adequate allowance for the cost of existing and proposed civilian programs. The new budget rests on a promise that, taken together, expenditures for programs other than for defense, space, and interest will be held "to this year's level, and even reduced somewhat." Keeping this promise has, of course, been simplified by revising the estimate of the current year's expenditures upward by $624 million, of which a substantial amount is for civilian programs. Otherwise, somewhat over $1.5 billion in expenditures increases for civilian programs are presumed to be offset by the purported expenditure reductions noted above. Whether the budget adequately allows for the costs of certain programs thus depends on whether these and other proopsed expenditure reductions can actually be made and whether the other existing civilian programs and the new programs—such as the new education program, the National Service Corps, and urban mass transportation—proposed in the state of the Union message and elsewhere can be held to stated levels. The allowances for these latter appear arbitrarily small, particularly when it is noted that the allowance for contingencies is only $200 million, or only two-tenths of 1 percent of the budget.

When the above areas of probable spending increases are coupled with the experience of the past 2 years—the fiscal year 1962 budget ran $3.5 billion more than President Kennedy's initial spending estimate and the fiscal year 1963 budget is now running $1.8 billion more than his original estimate—it appears reasonable to assume that fiscal year 1964 spending is not likely to be held at $98.8 billion, as projected, but will more likely run in the magnitude of $101 billion.

REVENUES

So many imponderables are involved, as the result of the proposed new tax legislation, that it is almost impossible to reach a valid judgment as to whether fiscal year 1964 receipts are likely to reach the $86.9 billion total estimated in the budget message. A reasonable guess might be that if no tax legislation is passed in the current session revenues might reach $90 billion whereas if legislation of the nature recommended by the President should pass that revenues might be in the magnitude of $85 billion or approximately the figure now estimated for the current fiscal year—fiscal year 1963.

A basic reason for doubting that fiscal year 1964 receipts would reach $86.9 billion if the tax cuts and reforms recommended by the administration were to be passed without change by the Congress derives from the reliance placed in the budget estimates on a presumed $2.6 billion increase in corporate income taxes. This is the second consecutive year an assumption of this nature has been made. The fiscal year 1963 budget estimates predicted a $5.3 billion increase in corporate taxes over fiscal year 1962—from $21.3 to $26.6 billion—but this figure has now been revised downward by $5.4 to $21.2 billion. The point here is that corporate tax receipts have held to a plateau of approximately $21 billion for the past decade and the President has estimated that last year's depreciation reform and investment credit will reduce taxes on business by over $2 billion. In consequence, even with the initial acceleration of corporate tax payments proposed in the budget, there seems little to suggest that taxable profits will rise sufficiently to provide the added corporate tax receipts projected in the budget.

DEFICIT

In view of the imponderables regarding prospective revenues it is difficult to project the likely deficit for fiscal year 1964. However, on the assumption that expenditures will probably run to $101 billion and that Congress will enact some form of tax cut, it seems reasonable to anticipate that the deficit will be at least $13 to $14 billion. This would result in both the highest spending of any year in American history and the largest deficit of any year in peacetime history.

PUBLIC DEBT

The public debt at the end of President Eisenhower's last full fiscal year in office was $286 billion. As the result of the $3.9 billion deficit in fiscal year 1961, the $6.4 billion deficit in fiscal year 1962, and the projected deficits of $8.8 billion in fiscal year 1963 and $11.9 billion in fiscal year 1964, the total debt is officially projected to increase to $316 billion at the end of fiscal year 1964 or by over 10 percent since 1960. Even this estimate is probably low and along with all the other changes in permanent and temporary debt ceilings which will have to be sought the next few months will require Congress to establish a temporary debt ceiling during fiscal year 1964 of approximately $325 billion to accommodate fluctuations in revenue collections.

ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY

Budgets are merely plans; what is more important in the scheme of things is the philosophy they reflect. Here lies reason for even greater concern than in the budget figures themselves.

With respect to taxes, for example, it is difficult to believe that the basis for the tax program has been thoroughly thought through. The opening paragraphs of the budget message note that the checkrein of taxes—estimated at over $150 billion a year at the Federal, State, and local levels—must be loosened. Yet the fact of the matter is that the Nation's tax bill will probably rise more than $6 billion this year. Federal income and excise taxes are estimated to rise about $1.5 billion in fiscal year 1964 despite the proposed tax cuts. Social security taxes will rise $2 billion this year and it has been estimated that State and local tax collections will rise about $3 billion. Proposed reductions in Federal taxes will reduce the total burden somewhat from what it might have been, but since total tax collections would apparently still run 4 percent or so more than last year, it is difficult to see how the tax program can provide the projected fillip to economic activity.

In the same vein, one must wonder whether the anticipated results could be achieved even if the total tax burden were to be reduced in the specified ways. It is one thing blithely to assert that the proposals for tax reduction and reform will step up the growth of the economy, improve productivity, and increase job and investment opportunities. It is another thing for this to happen. On the one hand there has been no showing that the reductions and reforms proposed are precisely those which will stimulate sound growth and investment so that they are directed at areas where additional incentives are likely to be most

effective. And on the other hand, there can be no certainty that even if these were the right types of reforms and reductions that individuals and corporations would spend the money in amounts or ways they were expected to, rather than save it or apply it to debts. This is not to question the desirability or beneficial effects of tax cuts as such; rather it is to question whether the proposed tax cuts would accomplish the specific ends which are projected.

The extreme fragility of the economic model can be illustrated in other ways. For example, it is suggested that the budget will be back in balance by fiscal year 1966 or 1967. There has been no explanation of how this is to be accomplished and at what level other than by reference to the fact that revenues rose rapidly after the tax cuts in 1954, thus permitting achievements of balanced budgets in fiscal years 1956 and 1957. What is conveniently overlooked, however, is that this equilibrium was in part brought about by 2 successive years of expenditure reductions which pulled the expenditure level down by nearly $10 billion below the fiscal year 1953 figure. Obviously, nothing like this is planned at the present. Indeed, the experience of the first 4 years of the present decade and the increasing amounts of spending authority which are being built up in excess of actual expenditures—unexpended balances at the end of fiscal year 1964 are estimated at $95 billion—suggest that under present planning the Federal budget will tend to rise at a rate of some $5 billion a year throughout the 1960's. If this occurs, there is certainly no evidence as yet that it can be balanced before the latter part of the decade or even that deficits in the magnitude of $10–$15 billion a year can be avoided over the next 2 or 3 years, unless substantial changes are made in the administration's tax and spending programs. The grim implications for our balance-of-payments position, or gold stock, and for confidence in the dollar of failure of the administration's fiscal gamble are plain to see. What is not plain to see is any allowance whatsoever for possible failure.

Almost as disturbing is the extent to which the concept of gross Government expenditures as a spur to the economy permeates the budget. The Budget Director has formally testified that:

> Reduced Federal purchases of goods and services in fiscal 1964 would, of course, reduce private production, employment, profits, and wages.

On this basis, increased Federal expenditures are presumably desirable and spending becomes an end in itself, freed from the normal constraints of program needs and priorities and of available revenues.

In the light of such concerns, one is hard pressed to accept the administration's assurances that the fiscal year 1964 budget is "frugal," and "prudent" and that its "tight discipline" limits expenditure program "severely." Indeed, even the use of such words suggests almost a rewriting of the English language. When coupled with assurances that deficits are really assets and surpluses a liability, we seem to be dealing no longer with "1964" but rather with "1984"—a la George Orwell.

CONCLUSION

Intrinsic to the entire picture is the matter of confidence. If the architects of the new fiscal program had demonstrated by performance during the past 2 years that their predictions could be expected to have validity there might be less reason for uneasiness as to the likelihood of success of this U.S. version of "The Great Leap Forward." The same would be true if there were evidence that the prescribed remedies had worked in the past.

Certainly there is little basis for confidence in the administration's economic and fiscal predictions. In fiscal 1962 the deficit turned out to be twice the original estimate. For fiscal 1963 the gross national product and anticipated revenues were hopelessly overstated, with the result that the initially projected $500 million surplus is now anticipated to turn into $9 billion deficit. The administration's 1963 targets for "full employment" and "reasonable equilibrium" in the balance of payments have now been quietly relegated to the indefinite future. Similarly, despite all the reliance which is to be placed on compensatory spending, there has been no evidence produced to demonstrate that it has ever worked in a comparable situation. In the light of the past, therefore, one is led to wonder if we are not again being asked to set sail on a troubled sea, bound for an unknown destination, with no certainty as to the adequacy of the fuel supply, and knowing only that on their last trip the pilots—though favored by a fair wind and a following sea—made landfall far from their stated destination.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn the other day from the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditure's that the Federal employee count—which, as of November 1963, was shown to have increased by 145,380 over the figure of 2,352,799 when President Kennedy took office in 1961—has now dropped by 9,870 as of the first half of fiscal 1963, ending December 31.

This is good news to all interested in economy and efficiency in our Federal Government. Even the added explanation that 3,837 of this decrease actually was a "paper change" instead of an actual reduction in force of live Federal employees did not dampen too much my feeling that perhaps we were at last headed in the right direction. Apparently the Veterans' Administration patient employees will no longer be included in the totals of Federal employment.

This, according to figures I have been keeping in mind, means that instead of the 145,380 increase under the Kennedy administration, we now have only a 135,510 increase—also taking into account the "paper switch" of employees.

In any event, my thoughts turned once more to a speech made by Senator Kennedy, while running for the Presidency, at an airport rally in Roanoke, Va., November 4, 1960. In the speech, among other things he was criticizing the Eisenhower administration for, he stated:

> This administration * * * they have added 106,000 new—nondefense—Federal employees. I think it is about time the American people knew.

I too think the American people should know and I hope the President will approve of my pointing out that during the first 2 years of his administration Federal employment increased by 135,510.

Just so the people will know, I will call attention to the President's 1964 budget message, sent to Congress on January 17, wherein he stated:

> This budget has been prepared with special attention to employment trends in the Federal Government. Requests for additional jobs have been reduced or denied wherever possible.

Apparently it was not possible to hold Federal employment down since the 1964 budget provides for 39,000 new Federal jobs.

Feeling that successful efforts should always be given attention, and in line with the President's desire—while a candidate—that the American people should be kept informed, I hope this information will be of interest and value.

ROMULO BETANCOURT, PRESIDENT OF VENEZUELA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week the President will throw out the Washington red carpet for Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela. We may expect a great deal of fulsome talk in the press, over the airwaves, and in all uninformed circles about Mr. Betancourt's stern anticommunism, and his great love of the United States.

I do not like to be a discordant voice at this love feast, but there are some questions which the American people would like to have answered before we go all out for this dubious visitor.

The high-priority question is, What is Betancourt after? His former Finance Minister, Dr. Andres German Otero, according to the New York Times, has stated that Betancourt's regime expects to obtain at least $1 billion in foreign loans, most of it from the United States—naturally. Since the statement was made, the Betancourt government has tapped practically every available lending agency in Washington, and the closest total I can obtain is that it

has pulled down already between $300 and $400 million.

Is President Kennedy going to be asked this week to pay up the rest, as the price of continued Betancourt "friendship"? And is he going to pay it?

The grim reflection for American taxpayers is that the Venezuela Government which Mr. Betancourt and his leftist friends overthrew in 1958—the government of President Marcos Perez Jimenez, handed down to Mr. Betancourt the legacy of a prosperous, advancing Venezuela which, so far from begging handouts, actually offered, at the Panama conference of 1956, to take the lead in launching an organization similar to the present Alliance for Progress, and to start it off with an initial Venezuela contribution of $30 million. As a matter of fact, former President Perez Jimenez and former President Kubitschev of Brazil were the fathers of the concept of the Alliance for Progress.

The First National City Bank, in its report of June 1957, 18 months before Betancourt came to power, described the financial shape of Venezuela under Perez Jimenez in the following words:

> External debt, other than the small Export-Import Bank loans, was liquidated a long time ago. Internal debt, consisting chiefly of Government-guaranteed obligations of various autonomous organizations is relatively modest.

Before we hand out any more U.S. money to prop up the tottery Betancourt regime, I believe we should pointedly ask Mr. Betancourt what he has done to the Venezuela economy that he is now going around, hat in hand, begging for loans. Venezuela is one of the most richly endowed nations in South America. Under the regime of his predecessor, Perez Jimenez, it was a have nation in a surrounding continent of have nots. What has Mr. Betancourt done to this once-prosperous country that it has fallen to its present low estate?

It is not that Mr. Betancourt has suffered any loss of government revenues. As a matter of fact, when he went into office, he sweetened the pot by requiring the oil companies to pay their taxes a year in advance. Professor Carlos Pietri Martinez, the distinguished Venezuelan economist, wrote, at the end of 1961:

> The revenues of the last 4 years are the highest of our history: they reach the incredible figure of Bs34 billion.

And he went on to state that these revenues which Betancourt and the preceding junta collected were more than half the amount pledged by the United States to underwrite the Alliance for Progress for the whole hemisphere.

> We, in only 4 years—

He wrote—

> have squandered more than half that amount.

Where has all this money gone? How much of it has been used, openly and covertly, to pad the government payrolls with Betancourt-supporting "don't works," or to finance Betancourt's far-flung schemes for leftist seizure of power throughout Latin America?

Let Mr. Kennedy's visitor answer these questions before we pour any more taxpayers' money down the rathole which is present-day Venezuela.

It is true that Betancourt is engaged in a contest for power today with the official Communist Party, led by the Machado brothers and Jesus Faria. But we would be naive indeed to leap to the conclusion that this means that Betancourt is on our side in the overall struggle with world communism. Many informed observers in Venezuela are convinced that Betancourt, who for 5 years was a functionary of the Communist international, has never ceased to be a Communist even though, today, he woos American help by calling himself anti-Communist. Years ago he announced, when dropping out of the Communist Party, that he proposed to make Venezuela a Communist country by "vaseline"—by putting over Marx-Leninism in Venezuela without the use of the Communist name. The letters are still extant, in an official document of the Venezuela Government, which contain this statement.

If he was unqualified in his anticommunism, does it not stand to reason that he would outlaw the Machado-led Communist Party and drive it out of Venezuela's political life, just as half the other nations of Latin America have already done? Instead, after temporizing with the official Communists for 4 years, he took the half measure last March of issuing an edict limiting their political activities but not outlawing them. The top leaders of the official Communist Party have never even been imprisoned.

But even this weak measure apparently was not sincere. On January 13, 1963, the Caracas press reported that Raul Leoni, Betancourt's top lieutenant and comrade from his Communist Party days—the man whom Betancourt is now supporting for the Presidency of Venezuela as his successor, gave a press conference. In this conference, Leoni held out the olive branch to the official Communists. He declared, as reported in the Caracas daily Ultima Noticias, that the Accion Democratica—Betancourt's party—would be willing to help rehabilitate the Communist Party if it would discontinue its insurrectional activities. This is a tacit admission that the whole fight of Betancourt against the official Communists is not a fight for principle but merely a sordid contest for power between two leftist factions.

There is a vast coverup of the sick record of misrule of Venezuela under its present leftist government. Those who try to get the facts before the people are quickly silenced. The American press receives nothing but the rosy-hued canned propaganda which drips out from the government offices.

One of the myths about Betancourt which has been zealously spread by his liberal backers in this country is that he has brought democracy and civil liberties to Venezuela. Actually, he rules Venezuela today almost as a police state. Since November 1960, when he persuaded the Venezuela Congress to grant the power to him, he has ruled Venezuela by executive decree.

We must not be deceived by every foreign politician who comes here, seeking our money, and calling himself anti-Communist. Remember Fidel Castro when he came to Washington in early 1959 made the public declaration that he was "going back to Cuba to fight the Communists." He fought them all right.

If Mr. Betancourt has been weak and pliant in his pretended fight against the official Communist Party, he has been merciless and stern in his fight against the true anti-Communists in Venezuela. Some 3,000 of them are in exile—the largest number of political exiles in Venezuela's history. Hundreds more, including the great anti-Communist leader, Gen. Castro Leon, are in Betancourt's notorious political prisons. Since he came to power, he has hounded former President Perez Jimenez, whom President Eisenhower praised in 1954 as an outstanding anti-Communist leader. He has gone to extremes to get Perez Jimenez extradited to Venezuela, for his probable death. So gullible are some people in this administration that Gen. Perez Jimenez, on December 12, 1962, was placed in the Dade County jail in Miami, and refused a continuance of his bail on the extradition charge, apparently on the request of Betancourt and as a condition of his visit.

This is the way a genuine Venezuela anti-Communist is treated, while chameleon Betancourt is lionized. No wonder we do not get anywhere in our fight against communism in Latin America.

Let us be courteous to Mr. Betancourt this week because he represents Venezuela, a country which we admire. But let us not be taken in by the claptrap that we are entertaining a great Venezuela President. Betancourt's rule in Venezuela has been a failure. He goes out of office execrated by great numbers of the conservative, decent Venezuelan people. On the eve of his visit, Venezuela was luridly lighted by the flames of the mob-made conflagration that burned the Sears, Roebuck warehouse to the ground, that destroyed the plant of the United States Rubber Co., that blew up the installations of the Shell Oil Co., that wrecked the power-lines to the Maracaibo oilfields. He comes from a country where law and order has completely broken down under his weak mob-tolerating rule.

Betancourt is not America's man in Venezuela. Let us risk no more American dollars propping up his incompetent and Communist-pampering rule.

WITHOUT VISION THE PEOPLE PERISH

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is sobering, to say the least. It appears in this morning's Wall Street Journal.

The title of the editorial is arresting and makes us realize that vision is what we lack.

Unfortunately, vision cannot be improved by automation or any other gimmick. It can only be supplied by the Almighty, and without it we cannot survive.

Yes, it is still true that "Without vision the people perish."

The editorial follows:

TAXATION WITHOUT VISION

Sometimes the trouble with asking seemingly unanswerable questions is that answers lie readily at hand. This misfortune, we fear, befell President Kennedy in his latest discussion of his tax program.

"What alternative," he asked his critics, "does anyone have for increasing and maintaining economic growth? * * *" In his view, the only alternative to this specific set of tax recommendations is restricted growth and higher unemployment.

Such categorical positions are characteristic of Government pronouncements. Take it or leave it, Congress and the people are told, or if you change this, then you must pay such and such a penalty.

The facts are quite different. Before getting to alternatives, it must be noted that this Government deliberately ignores a large element of any sound tax program. That is the matter of Federal spending and deficits. Our officials seem unable to discover any connection between high spending and high taxes. As for red ink, they take the Orwellian view that today's deficits equal tomorrow's surpluses.

Now if taxes could be considered in this vacuum, the case for substantial rate reductions would be overpowering. Mr. Kennedy puts it well when he says that the U.S. tax system was written during wartime (and the preceding depression) to restrain growth. Unfortunately for his argument, it does not follow at all that "the most effective thing that can be done at this time is our tax program."

For this particular program violates many of the principles of reasonable taxation. These criteria are well summarized in a new study by the Tax Foundation, and they are worth noting even though they will scarcely find favor in Washington today.

A tax program, for example, should generally provide enough revenues to cover spending—an elementary rule persistently flouted by this and every other administration for the past 30 years. Granted that no tax system can, strictly speaking, be equitable, at least an attempt at fairness should be made.

Taxation of income from additional effort at rates ranging from 0 to 91 percent, as the Tax Foundation puts it, does not qualify as fairness, but in trying to weed out inequities the designers of the new proposals have only compounded them.

Furthermore, a sensible structure would minimize the tax penalties on business. Not because business is something sacrosanct—it certainly isn't that in the eyes of officialdom—but because it is the specific human activity which alone can make an economy prosper. In the words of the foundation study, "business is the major agency for organizing to produce—for allocating productive capacity and its use today and for undertaking economic growth."

The administration's program, with its grudging and slow-moving business rate reductions coupled with new restrictions, retains the punitive antienterprise bias of the thirties. It thus not only contradicts principle but flies in the face of the Government's own professed desire for economic growth.

In addition, a tax system should be simple. Instead we have a tax code of over 900 pages of confusion, a monstrosity hardly equaled in the world, and that's only the beginning of it. The new program would not diminish the complexity but add to it.

In basic tax principles is embedded the basis for a sound alternative to the current proposals. The administration, to its credit, has perceived that the present tax structure is an economic depressant, but it has largely failed to pursue the logic of that perception.

Why? Because a sound program would be politically impossible? To most observers the program as it stands looks pretty close to impossible. Real tax improvement doesn't have to be bad politics.

The alternatives to this unimaginative program exist. What is lacking is the vision to see them.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial appeared in the Evening News, in Newburgh, N.Y., on the 13th of February.

Here once again we see that what is sauce for the goose is definitely not sauce for the gander, in this case the taxpaying public.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Government can pay a young man $75 a month, but if I do so I will land in jail, or at the very least have a lawsuit on my hands.

The editorial follows:

MINIMUM EMPLOYMENT

While unemployment grows and many of our young people look for out-of-school jobs, it wouldn't hurt to wonder how long it will be before a strange legal situation forces them into the Peace Corps and the Youth Conservation Corps, for which a pay standard of $75 a month has been proposed.

The Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel figures that this works out to about 43 cents an hour for a 40-hour week. It also notes that sponsors of such legislation are asking for the Government a privilege denied to private industry.

We might add that politicians and various economists and union leaders hold up their hands in horror at the thought of such a pay standard for stores, hotels and light industry.

The Knoxville newspaper goes on to state, "Under legislation passed 2 years ago the minimum legal wage for private employers is $1 to $1.15, soon to go up to $1.25. This is little enough for heads of families but it undoubtedly operates to deny jobs to thousands of youngsters who are without experience and aren't considered worth those wages.

"Even with concessions made for students, minimum permissible wages still are about twice what would be offered by these two new Government Corps."

Experience indicates that many poorly paid jobs like packing food sacks and loading cars at market or washing automobiles just disappear when wages get too high. Yet these are jobs which may give a youngster part-time work, on a chance to earn date money. And they may lead to better jobs for those who are observant and keen.

The News-Sentinel says, "Minimum wage legislation in this area, including the record-keeping which is required, is immeasurably responsible for the alarming rise in unemployment among the young.

"The question: If $75 a month is enough for the Government to pay, then why isn't it permitted to private business? Or, to put it another way, if $75 isn't enough in private employment, why should the Government pay less?"

As we see young people idled by lack of odd jobs and out-of-school employment, summer or otherwise, we might ponder the effect of legislation which seems to favor Government while discriminating against private industry. Surely, the youngster who gets only $75 a month from the Government is no better off than the one who gets $75 a month from the butcher, the baker or the candlestick maker.

U.N. AGRICULTURAL AID TO COMMUNIST CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, with the announcement several days ago that the United Nations had granted agricultural aid to Cuba, considerable protest was voiced in this body. I was among those who protested.

In a statement for the RECORD on February 14, page 2230, I voiced my opposition to the action by the United Nations in granting aid to Communist Cuba. This act by the United Nations is an extremely unwelcome and discordant action. It puts the U.N. and the United States at odds over policy toward Cuba.

I stated at that time that I fully supported the investigation of this and related issues which has been undertaken in the other body and announced by Senator CHURCH. Because of the continuing protest of my constituents, I repeat that which I previously said:

This is a matter in which all of us—the Foreign Affairs Committee which has jurisdiction and the Members of this House—will continue to be vitally interested. It would appear timely to have a complete reassessment of the U.S. positions in the specialized programs of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all will agree with me that this body should not undertake an investigation similar in nature and scope to that being conducted by the other body. The facts are that the official U.S. position, with which I am in agreement was opposed to the granting of the aid, but we obviously did not have the votes in the Governing Council of the Special Fund to prevent the action. I am confident that the investigation in the other body will be sufficient on this matter. However, if it is not, then our committee which has jurisdiction will certainly undertake to fill in any gaps.

THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLOWING UP OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE" AND OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the annual occasion on which I reach out with the hope, and somehow the faith, that I am talking to history.

No greater disservice ever has been done the image of our country in our own eyes, as well as the eyes of the world, as that rendered by some modern writers in their treatment of the war with Spain, which was triggered by the blowing up of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Savana 65 years ago on Friday last.

They misinterpret the motivations and the events of an earlier period of old-fashioned American patriotism and a war of pure idealism. I have no personal quarrel with them, any more than I have with fine and beautiful ladies who conform to changing dress vogues even when the current styles in their individual cases might not enhance their own type of beauty.

In 1898 most American women were their own dressmakers. They had neither the money nor the desire to buy store clothes. In most cases they had a feminine pride in designing and sewing together their own gowns, and most mothers made the dresses of their children and with the sons down to their first short trousers on their graduation from kilts.

No one in his right mind would look to a well-dressed American woman of 1963, and most American women do have taste, to pass judgment on the styles and dress of 1898. How, then, can one accept the interpretation of the spirit of 1898, when America moved forward in a war of unselfish idealism to meet its rendezvous with destiny, by historians born years after the event?

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. Speaker, I have said that in my remarks today, as well as the remarks I have made every year in this historic Chamber since first I was elected to the Congress, I have the hope, and somehow the faith, that I am speaking to history. I am thinking of the researchers who will come, long after all of us have played our parts and are gone, to the Library of Congress and will browse over the printed volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am thinking of the time, far away perhaps, when in the perspective and evaluation of history the 50-year period beginning with the war with Spain, then a period of peace and muscle flexing, and World War I, then another period of peace and preparation, and World War II, all this as the 50-year war that ushered in the golden centuries of American world leadership.

WAR OF PURE IDEALISM

I want to set the record straight for these researchers. The commencement of this cycle of half a century that changed the world more drastically than any material cycle of events in history was the war with Spain. It was a war of pure idealism. It was the only war in history fought entirely, as far as the United States was concerned, by volunteers. It was fought on land and sea in the Pacific and the Atlantic. On land it was fought by green troops, inadequately equipped, with food unfit for human consumption and practically no medicine. Against these staggering odds, the war on land and sea in the Pacific and the Atlantic was fought and won in 7½ months.

No war in the history of the world in comparable time accomplished so much for freedom and mankind. It started a chain of dynamic events that changed the political face of the universe and carried every human being in the world forward in his eternal quest for a higher plateau of human contentment and dignity.

It was a war of idealism. The "Spirit of 1898" was an expression of old-fashioned American patriotism, of faith in God and country. It was a rededication of all the American people, in cities and hamlets and on the farms, to the pledge of the signers of the Declaration of Independence of their "lives and fortunes and sacred honor." It was proclaimed and waged and terminated in the finest spirit of self-abnegation ever shown in all recorded history.

VANQUISHED SPAIN HELPED TO ITS FEET

What nation in all history has accorded to a crushed and beaten foe, stripped forever of its once-proud world power, its day of glory ended and poverty at home eating at its vitals, the compassion that the United States showed to Spain? Instead of demanding war indemnity to cover the cost of the war that we had won, the United States actually helped the vanquished Spain to get back on its feet to care for its own impoverished people.

To the peoples of Puerto Rico, liberated from the enslavement of colonialism, the United States gave vast sums of money, by the standards of that period, to tide them over a devastating famine.

To the brave soldiers of Cuba, who long had waged a war for liberation against overwhelming odds until American soldiers joined them as comrades in freedom's fight, the United States gave liberal payments in money with which to buy the tools of agriculture to rebuild the shattered economy of their beloved country. The United States gave to Cuba, freely, unconditionally, and with our blessing and good wishes, the independence as a sovereign nation that long had been the dream of every Cuban heart.

To the Philippines we sent the cream of our youth to serve in all the remote corners of the island as schoolteachers laying the stout foundations in education of popular government as they had been laid in our own country. No other nation in all the recorded history of mankind, left by a war that it had won in possession of such rich territories, wrested from the enemy, abstained as did the United States from taking one acre for itself or one cent of tribute and instead poured out its wealth in money, sweat, toil, and sacrifice for human betterment in a spirit of pure idealism.

LAW OF POLITICAL GRAVITATION

The women of 1898 were not ashamed of the homemade dresses they wore. The men of 1898 were not ashamed of their simple honest faith in their country, their idealism, and their indoctrination with good old-fashioned patriotism.

No generation can be reconstructed on the customs, the conditions and the mores of a later generation. The historians who find permanent place in the world's literature first have reached maturity in a realization of this eternal truth.

The law of gravitation has a political as well as physical impact. It is manifest in the rise and fall of empires, of dynasties, of world powers if we read the histories of those departed eras with the guiding thought to our interpretation that all life is change and the flower of spring has the destiny ahead of development into the fruit or vegetable of the late summer or the autumn. In no lesser measurement young nations, the products of ever-changing conditions, are drawn on to their destinies by the pull of the law of a political gravitation that as yet we have not charted and recognize only in its dim outlines.

On my study missions to Africa I sense in the faces and the voices, not only of those of education and training in leadership, but of the unlettered masses as well, clear evidence of a pull of political gravitation somewhat comparable, I fancy, to that experienced by our early Americans.

In 1898 the term "manifest destiny" was still in popular usage. In this generation it is a term in disfavor. In 1963, when we have become the most powerful nation of the free world, we speak properly of "world responsibility." We are what we are, and ours is a position of grave responsibility. Our use of words and phraseology must be realistic and exact.

IN 1898 WE WERE WHAT WE WERE TO BE

In 1898 we were, in the minds of our people, what we were to be. We were as the blossoming buds of spring that were to be the fruit and the vegetables of late summer and autum.

A new era was opening. There was to be a half century of alternate war and peace from which the United States was to emerge with the awesome challenge of leading in the task of rebuilding a world of freedom, and understanding and human dignity.

To say that the Americans of 1898 were conscious of events to happen, and that their thinking and their actions were charted by the blueprints of the future would be sheer recklessness. I mean no such implication.

I do respectfully maintain, however, that among them was a strong compelling sense of what our country was to be, that they gave expression to this innate sense when they used such terms as "manifest destiny," and when they went to war with Spain, still at the time

of declaration of war regarded as one of the great world powers.

It was the pull of the law of gravitation, as potent, as eternal, in its political as in physical manifestations.

In an humble effort to recapture for our Nation the spirit of 1898 and to quiet the confusion that has come from the attempt to reconstruct the era on the manners, customs, and mores of 1963, I shall now address myself to what are the most commonly circulated libels on the war with Spain.

LIBEL NO. 1

It was the unwanted war. That is libel No. 1. The fact is that war was declared by the Congress, without a dissenting vote, and not a single Member of the Congress was defeated at the next election because of that vote.

On April 25, 1898, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 10086 by voice and the Senate passed the resolution by unanimity. H.R. 10086 declared that "war exists between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain, and the same is hereby declared to exist, and that war has existed since the 21st day of April A.D. 1898, including said day, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain." It directed and empowered the President of the United States "to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into active service of the United States the militia of the several States to such extent as may be necessary to carry this action into effect."

I would be the first to admit that all wars have been unwanted, in the sense that mothers and fathers in all generations, I am sure, would have preferred the paths of peace for their children. With the benefit of hindsight, possibly many wars could have been avoided. There are so many "ifs" in history.

But, to single out the Spanish-American War, the most idealistic and unselfish armed conflict in our national history, as the unwanted war, as though all others were the legitimate and welcomed children of our national historical family and it alone was the unnatural and unwanted child, is the most unjustifiable of libels.

MCKINLEY AND LINCOLN

Many wars might have been averted if there had been the advantage of hindsight, and in our eternal quest for a permanent peace, a goal I have the faith some day will be reached, I think a useful purpose is served in reviewing the circumstances that preceeded the reaching of the point of no return in the armed conflicts of the past. What I object to is the singling out of our war with Spain.

President McKinley was a man of peace, more interested and better versed in the tariffs governing the trade of the world than in the international tensions that menace international amity. It is, however, unfair to his memory to suggest that he was pulled into the war with Spain against his own judgment and convictions by a tide of emotions and of pressures.

President Abraham Lincoln was a man of peace, and until the last moment before the point of no return, he had hoped that the terrible years of civil war to follow would be averted.

National judgments that lead a representative democracy to the grim tragedy of war come from an interpretation by the executive and the Congress of the will of the people. They represent in the final analysis the meeting of many minds of varying approaches and tests of evaluation.

Much is made in a recent scholarly work on the war with Spain of the belief in the mind of our minister to Spain at the time that Spain was on the verge of departing from Cuba, was even willing to give the island over to annexation by the United States.

Chamberlain, when he returned to England, was filled with the peaceful intentions of Hitler. Human nature, frail and imperfect as it is, can fail both in excessive caution and excessive lack of caution.

ON AUGUST 1, 1898, THE WAR WAS OVER

What should be noted in the recital of Spain's reported willingness to quit its colonial hold on Cuba, without a fight or a murmur, is that the alleged date of the turnover was set at August 1, 1898. I was at Santiago de Cuba on July 17, 1898. I had been there since shortly after mid-June of 1898. On July 17, 1898—the date of the armistic—the fighting was over, the war had been won, and Cuba indeed was free. This was 2 weeks earlier than August 1, 1898. It is quite possible, even probable, that as early as July 1, 1898, when the Spanish fleet at Santiago was sunk and the Spanish army crushed, that Spain was willing to release its hold on Cuba. The war already had been won by the United States.

LIBEL NO. 2

It was Hearst's war. That is libel No. 2. It is pure nonsense. Hearst was a colorful young newspaper publisher of the period, and his newspapers did print dramatic and colorful reports of conditions in Cuba and, after the sinking of the *Maine*, of the angry indignation of the American people in the cities, the hamlets, on the farms, everywhere. American newspapers, including the highly respected New York Times, gave full coverage to the events leading up to World War I and World War II. I have never heard anyone say that World War I and World War II were brought on by the newspapers.

I was 15 when war was declared, still 15 when I left the sophomore class in high school to enlist. I became 16 a few days thereafter. Young as I was, I was in a much better spot to know the temper of the American people at that time than those who were born years later.

Seven of my high school classmates joined with me in volunteering as soldiers, and we landed in Cuba together after only a few weeks training to fight for what we, our parents at home and the American people as a whole, thought was a noble war of liberation.

When our company entrained at Benton Harbor in Michigan as we left for the fighting front it seemed to me that everybody had turned out to see us off. There were the same crowds at all the stops. When we returned from Cuba after the campaign the crowds were even larger, if that were possible.

I do not think that a boy of 16 is likely to misjudge the emotion and the sentiment that are unveiled in his presence. When I read that someone, attempting to reconstruct the spirit of 1898 half a century later, charges that the War with Spain was brought on by a newspaper I think back to those faces, those cheers, and those prayers of American men and women, in towns and in country places.

Most of them had never seen a New York newspaper. In 1898 no newspaper had a circulation of any considerable size. The Benton Harbor News-Palladium covered the community where I was attending high school. Perhaps 30 or 40 copies of the Tribune and other Chicago newspapers came in; none from New York. Newspapers with circulations reaching a million and more came many years later. There were one or two periodicals, with subscription rates as low as 10 cents a year, with great national circulations, but they did not go in for news.

To charge that the generation of 1898 was duped by journalistic warmongers is an indictment of that generation of which I and my parents were parts. That I resent.

LIBEL NO. 3—CLOSE TO TREASON

It was a war of imperialism. This is libel No. 3 and one that comes close to treason. It is based upon the thin reasoning that at a later period the disposition of the Philippines figured in an American political campaign and the cry of imperialism was raised against a relatively small minority of the American people who favored hanging onto the Philippines.

But to say that at the time of the sinking of the *Maine* 65 years ago last Friday, or at the time of the declaration of war on April 25, 1898, lust for power or territory or any selfish gain of any nature whatsoever was a factor, even of the most minor sort, in the making of our national judgment is to participate in a totally unjustified downgrading of our country that merits the condemnation of all thoughtful and patriotic Americans.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE "MAINE'S" HEROIC DEAD

A war that brought so much to the world, that ushered in events that changed the life of every human being, that cost the United States so much in money and in men, and for the waging and winning of which the United States neither asked nor received one cent or one acre, was one of the great epochal adventures in pure unselfish idealism in the long story of mankind. It reflects the true image of Uncle Sam.

Future generations can honor the memory of the 266 American heroes who died with the *Maine* 65 years ago in no better way than by protecting and preserving that image.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in defense of the generation of my boyhood. It

was a generation of good and noble people. It was a generation of simple living and honest thinking men and women. It was a generation of idealists, in the finest expression of that idealism that gives purpose and direction to human ends.

I am grateful to the younger Members of this historic body; most of them veterans of World War I or of World War II, many with outstanding combat records of which they never speak. From the bottom of my heart I thank them for their gracious understanding and even kindly treatment of the last veteran of the war with Spain in the Congress of the United States.

As long as Providence and the support of my constituents permit me to remain in the Congress I shall continue annually on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* to do all within my humble power to set the record straight on the war with Spain for succeeding generations.

"KING COAL" DYING FAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONNER). Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for 30 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, just before I left my office I received the attached correspondence from the White House.

At this time I would like to make it a part of the RECORD with a few comments:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The President has asked me to acknowledge your letter of February 7 expressing your concern over reports that changes were being contemplated in the residual fuel oil import control program that would weaken it.

Prior to April 1 the Department of the Interior must announce new quotas. They will probably base their allocations on the report of the Office of Emergency Planning. I was pleased to note that that report called for a continuation of the residual oil import control program.

I do not know to what extent existing quotas will be modified, but I will see that your letter is called to the attention of the Department of the Interior.

Thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel
to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the record that somewhere along the line the White House Deputy Counsel got his lines crossed.

The contrary is true. The Office of Emergency Planning has recommended the opposite to what Mr. Feldman states in that if the President follows its recommendations there will be complete abandonment of the residual oil control program.

Further, once the program falls by the wayside it will only be a matter of a few years or even months before the whole oil control program is abandoned.

This follows as night follows day, simply because to produce residual, an oil country must sell its crude.

One wonders how long the patriotic impulses of coal users in America can withstand the powerful inducement of fuel oil dumped into the United States at any price that undercuts the b.t.u. cost of coal.

"King Coal" may not be dead but his children are awful sick.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House today is to call to your attention the seriousness of the recommendation of the Office of Emergency Planning in the matter of imported residual oil.

I find no cause for joy in this recommendation nor do I find any shred of hope for the struggling communities of our coal producing areas in the United States. If any joy is expressed it must must be by the Venezuelans and the self-serving profiteers in the oil import and distribution system of the New England States.

For many years the domestic fuels industries have tried to work out the national fuels problems with cooperative studies and planning. Every time their efforts start to bring order out of chaos and the various industries and their dependents begin to level off into a reasonably productive era along comes the import lobby, and some nonelected political bureaucrat issues a come and get it order to the ever hungry international oil companies and their domestic bird dogs.

Director Edward McDermott's recommendation will make this Nation dependent upon outside sources for our national fuel needs and eventually our petroleum industries will join the coal fields in their chronic depression and unemployment.

This Congress passed a coal research bill a few years ago. The people in this industry are being taxed millions of dollars for this purpose, to search out and find uses for coal in order to save the economy of our coal areas.

The greatest amount of research money has so far been allocated by Secretary Udall to the development of a process for turning coal into oil.

In the same breath the Secretary ordered more millions of barrels of oil from foreign countries to use in place of coal for fuel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a joke is a joke but it is no joke to the thousands of destitute miners, their families and their communities.

We have deposits of coal to last for a period of 1,000 years at a 400 million ton-year production. During this thousand years there is no doubt that nuclear development will supplant coal as a basic fuel. The transition from mineral fuels to nuclear fuels will take time, time which will allow for the development of coal uses other than fuel, will give our mining industry a gradual phasing out and will allow our communities to adjust.

The open door policy of destroying the industry by the importation of foreign fuels does not allow the domestic industry or the domestic worker to participate in the employment or the profits of the substitute fuel.

It is a matter of record that there need be no residual oil left from the refinery process and actually under the label of residual waste we are being sold oil that rightfully belongs in the petroleum products industry and not in the fuel industry.

Some oil countries are producing residual at a rate 45 percent of the crude oil while here in the United States of America we are refining the crude in some cases without a single drop of residual waste.

Are we then buying waste or are we in fact buying a competitive fuel produced expressly for the U.S. market?

It is my humble opinion that the history of the decline of the coal industry and it is impending demise is just a pattern that will be followed in the elimination of many of our domestic industries by the combined forces and greed of the internationalist importers, exporters, and exploiters.

These groups have little or no allegiance to any nation. They jiggle their incomes and profit taxwise to pay as little as possible, they deal in dollar economics and completely ignore human economies.

I studied the tax picture of a large international American-based oil company and I have come up with some rather enlightening figures. Incidentally, if coal producers and their employees enjoyed the same consideration as oil companies, subsidized and tariff protected wheat and cotton growers, they would not worry about the profiting internationalists.

For too many years oil has enjoyed a position that has been described as "sacred and profitable."

Our administration is now trying to crack the sanctuary wall which has sheltered the profits of our international oil corporations. Middle East oil companies have long been protected by admirals, diplomats, and tax accountants. At the moment, our fleet and Air Force are making symbolic visits to Saudi Arabian ports and air fields to impress, warn, or reassure the various parties involved in the Yemen conflict—Nasser, Sallal, Faisal, and Hussein. But the Arabian American Oil Co.—Aramco—does not pay as much as the cost of an oil change for these maneuvers because, to the best of our knowledge, it has not been paying Federal income taxes to the United States.

All this is bewildering to most taxpayers—but it can be explained. Aramco's latest financial records are not public property, but a summary of 1955 and 1956 earnings, entered into a Senate debate in 1958, will suffice to offer tabular illustration—bearing in mind that the figures probably have risen in ensuing years by about 25 percent.

Aramco pays Saudi Arabia royalties, which are deducted from income. In addition, Aramco pays taxes to Saudi

Arabia. These, like all foreign taxes, are treated as tax credits against U.S. taxes.

Here is the condensed Aramco financial statement:

[In millions]

	1955	1956
Total earnings	$724.3	$748.8
Deduct royalties of	78.4	80.3
Deduct costs and expenses of	181.0	188.3
Leaving an income of	464.9	480.2
From which deduct 27½ percent depletion allowance, based on income from crude	121.6	127.5
Leaving a U.S. taxable income of	343.2	352.7
U.S. taxes to Saudi Arabia total	178.4	183.4
	192.7	199.4
Therefore, Aramco paid no U.S. income taxes. Instead, it had an unused tax credit, which, under existing law could be applied as a credit against other income earned abroad, of	(14.2)	(16.0)

That excess tax credit is one of the targets of the new Kennedy tax reform. The President is seeking to prevent our oil companies from using excess tax credits arising from crude oil operations as in the Middle East to offset U.S. tax liabilities on other forms or sources of foreign income, such as refining or distribution operations by affiliates in Europe or other parts of the world.

In another reform, the President proposes that deduction of foreign development costs should apply only to the income from these operations and should not be permitted to reduce the U.S. tax on domestic income.

The administration has not requested any reduction in the highly controversial 27½-percent depletion allowance. Past efforts by Senate liberals, like Senators DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, and MORSE, to cut the allowance have been defeated in Congress. But the administration calculates that its reforms will save $300 million—most of it from domestic oil operations. It proposes to cut the depletion allowance, indirectly, by strict enforcement of the ceiling—the existing statutory limitation of 50 percent of net income. This is to be accomplished by requiring corporations to charge drilling and development costs in computing their net income—a requirement that would not affect our oversea oil companies because their production costs are so low.

Would reduction of the depletion allowance affect the fortunes of our Middle East oil companies?

During past Senate debates, experts estimated that elimination of the Aramco depletion allowance in 1955 and 1956 would have gained as much as $99 million for the U.S. Treasury. But spokesmen for the oil industry insist that any reduction in the depletion allowance for oversea operations would not have benefited the Treasury because the Arab governments would have merely increased taxes, thereby preempting the $99 million for themselves.

But that argument presupposes that the amounts paid to Saudi Arabia are ordinary taxes, that they can be raised by unilateral action of the Saudi Arabian Government. In fact, the taxes are a component of total royalties which are negotiated—not enacted. It is true, of course, that Arab oil experts claim that the companies have made inordinate profits in the past and that the Arab governments are entitled to a larger share—the above table shows that Saudi Arabia's combined income from royalties and taxes totaled $280 million in 1956. In 1961, the total was estimated at $350 million.

What about the impact on prices? In the past, the oil companies have posted high prices for crude oil because the size of their depletion allowance depended on their gross receipts from crude oil sales. In consequence, the companies' own refineries, and those of their customers, have shown very little profit. This may also have boosted the bills of consumers, our friends and allies in Europe, as well as the U.S. Navy and Air Force.

In recent years, however, the price structure has been cracking for other reasons; Soviet competition and spectacular oil strikes in Africa have ended monopoly. And the administration proposals may hasten this process.

We do not know how much the new Treasury proposals will cost Middle East companies. One guess puts it at between $25 and $50 million. But large oil companies may come out ahead in any event because of the proposed reduction in the U.S. corporation tax.

Domestic oil companies will surely fight the President's proposals on the hill. It will be interesting to observe the extent to which foreign policy considerations will influence the debate.

If the past is any criteria in all probability considerations for the foreign potentates and ruling cliques will supersede the economic consideration in this area of State-Commerce Department activities.

Fellow Members, in these trying days of continuing, and in many industries, expanding unemployment, one wonders if we have a true concept of the basic requirements for a healthy and growing economy in an industrial complex.

For too many years we have placed in first consideration the welfare of certain industries and in some cases certain countries and have given second or no consideration to other industries and our own economic well-being.

There has grown up in this country, either by design or by accident, a feeling that ours is an unlimited and boundless horn of plenty, with no bottom, no ceiling, and the sides stretching beyond the horizons.

This is not true in the balance of human endeavors, desires, ambitions, wants, and needs. It is especially untrue in the field of trade economics.

It is only true in the minds of those whose well-being is not dependent upon the daily struggle to keep "their bellys full."

No reasonable person objects to helping a neighbor, be he next door or at the far corners of the earth. Any reasonable person can object however, when we lose sight of the simple economic fact that one must always maintain the ability to provide help in order to give help.

The coal industry is a case in point. No industry has performed so well in updating its production facilities in its relationship with mine labor and finally in its efforts to introduce new needs and uses for their product.

All this, however, has failed to keep the job opportunities in this industry at a rate required for a healthy economic climate, industrywide or in keeping with our national need.

Why is this so? Simply because of action by our own Government in the area of trade wherein imports of competitive fuels have destroyed the gains made by this industry. We have completely forgotten the basic principle so needed in a healthy economy.

We have forgotten job protection. It is unpopular today to talk protectionism and yet without job protection all else fades and soon we will be a Nation of workers half producing and half not producing.

I say this knowing full well, the implications of my remarks. When we consider industrial and agricultural producers as against those whose incomes in whole or in part are dependent upon the services rendered to the production workers or upon public taxes, the load carried by the production dollar becomes very heavy.

No nation can survive in an atmosphere of unrealistic theory and public policy. The Nation's oftentimes repeated policy is to make all other nations self-dependent and yet at the same time we follow a course destroying our own self-dependency.

Even today unless we can keep the trade lines open it will be next to impossible to gear up, tool up, and produce for a major war of any duration.

We have lost supremacy in so many fields of production that it is becoming a serious problem just to hold on as an industrial complex in a world fast becoming a massive automated machine shop.

Sooner or later the nations whose economies are based upon selling to the U.S. market will find the well has gone dry and eventually will have to turn to their own markets for a sustaining economy.

We cannot buy all the world's production but we are trying like heck to do it.

We not only offer to go into the trade ring with the Common Market but in the same breath—Trade Expansion Act—we take on all comers.

When you consider our domestic costs of production, based upon mandated, fixed costs for power and services, labor and taxes, plus raw materials, it is like a free-for-all with the United States represented by a blindfolded lightweight with one hand strapped behind his back in a ring with each GATT nation and every underdeveloped nation represented by heavyweights two hands free and no blindfolds.

If you think this is far fetched read the reports of the hearing on the impact of imports, count the industries affected, evaluate the man-hours and wages lost by imports as against gains from exports and then tell me if you still think I am wrong.

No nation can survive in a free-for-all trade war unless it can produce with

slave or near slave labor, low or no taxes, subsidy or tax credits.

In the end it will wind up in international bankruptcy, and whether we like it or not, De Gaulle's position is giving many U.S. workers a reprieve from the unemployment lines.

The trouble is that while all our front runners are screaming about De Gaulle's grand design they forget that we have a grand design of our own which includes such catchy words as "EurAmerica," "Atlantic Union," "GATT," "oil imports," and so forth.

One wonders whether we are not in about the same fix as the kid caught with his hand in the cookie jar.

I refuse to believe as of today that the President of the United States will ignore or set aside without consideration this plea of 102 Members of the House in this serious matter posed by the McDermott division.

I received the following correspondence which I believe to be of interest to all Members of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 14, 1963.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your concern, along with that of 101 of your colleagues, regarding excessive importation of foreign residual oil, and the need to maintain reasonable import controls on such oil, was clearly shown by your signing the letter to the President of February 7, 1963.

In spite of your recommendation, the Office of Emergency Planning recommended to the President on February 13, 1963, the further relaxing of all controls on foreign residual oil. The report also declared that the Nation did not need to depend on natural resources within its own borders for its security, thus implying that import limits on crude oil also are unnecessary.

We have sent you a copy of our statement expressing consternation over this action.

A statement by you on this matter is urgent to give the President your opinion on these recommendations. We are also hopeful you will feel it proper to express your views on the floor of the House when it reconvenes Monday. This is a critical emergency for all domestic fuels.

JOSEPH E. MOODY,
President.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13.—President Joseph E. Moody, of National Coal Policy Conference today issued the following statement:

"The recommendations of the Office of Emergency Planning Director Edward McDermott, if accepted by the President, will constitute the most serious blow that this administration has so far dealt the men and their families of the coal and related industries. The interest of hundreds of thousands of American citizens were brushed callously aside for purposes of political expediency.

"It is difficult to reconcile this report with the repeated statements of the President expressing his concern for the domestic fuel industries, especially coal. If these recommendations are carried out it can mean disaster in the economies of West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois and other States.

"It is our understanding that the report is the same except for some word changes as it was in September 1962. It recommends that the import program on residual oil be gradually abandoned and further serves notice the same is in store for the rest of the import program on crude oil and other products.

"In that the report has been in the making since May 1961 and the present form reportedly has been available since last September, the coincidence of the visit next week of Mr. Betancourt, President of Venezuela, can hardly be ignored.

"The threat of 'Castroism' hanging over one Latin American country, and the recurrent riots by the Communist elements there seem able to panic the U.S. Government while it remains unconcerned about the critical plight of its own citizens.

"The report reaches the strange conclusion that 'The adequacy of resources is not strictly a national problem—is not one for which one looks for an answer within the geographical limits of the United States.'

"This means that, in the opinion of the OEP Director, America need no longer be concerned with developing and strengthening its own resources, and can only be interpreted as meaning that import restrictions on crude oil are also considered unnecessary.

"If this revolutionary thinking is accepted by the President, the ultimate end can only mean far greater damage to both the American coal and petroleum industries. Dependence of our economy, as well as our national security, on the tenuous availability of fuel from foreign countries, in view of the current situation in the Caribbean, with Russia tightening its military hold on Cuba and Venezuela constantly threatened by Communist riots and unrest, could be disastrous.

"The domestic fuels industries have kept the Congress advised over the years and there have been many of the members of Congress who have expressed deep concern that the welfare of the domestic fuels industries was important to the strength of the economy of this Nation. As has been so often true in the history of this Nation, matters of this nature of such vital concern to so great a part of the American people, may have to be finally settled by the Congress.

"The conclusions of the OEP Director are completely contrary to findings by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives which held extensive hearings on the question of oil imports and recommended just last month that 'the import quotas of residual fuel oil to be used solely as fuel should be fixed at a level no higher than the total of such imports in 1961, so as to reduce the threat to national security which residual oil imports now create.'

"It should be recalled that this conclusion was reached by the Small Business Committee following extensive hearings by a subcommittee headed by Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma."

Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of the OEC Director on top of the unwarranted increase in residual oil import quotas for the remainder of this quarter announced recently represents another severe blow to the already seriously damaged coal industry.

The total increase—17,000 barrels per day, for the full year to be available in the next 2 months—is more than 6.5 million barrels, or the equivalent of 1.5 million additional tons of coal to be displaced in the next 2 months.

"This lost coal production would have provided jobs for more than 600 U.S. coal miners for a full year, or 3,600 miners during the next 2 months," Mr. Moody said. These destroyed miners' jobs can now be added to the 17,000 full-time jobs already lost each year to imported residual oil, which now displaces more than 45 million tons of U.S. coal annually.

Today's action was taken at the same time that a spokesman for the administration acknowledged to us that there has been an increase in imports in the first 8 months of the quota year of over 17 million barrels and that consumption on the east coast has been 5.6 million barrels less than was anticipated by the Bureau of Mines in their demand forecast on which quotas were established last April.

The Department of Interior press release announcing the new increase stated that there was a reduction of 4 million barrels in stocks as of December 31, and that the supply of domestic residual for the east coast this year had proved to be approximately 10 million barrels less than was anticipated by the Bureau of Mines.

However, the Geological Survey, which compiles such figures for the Department of Interior, reports that shipments of domestic residual from the gulf coast for the period April through November declined 4,442,000 barrels and the Bureau of Mines reports that refinery output of domestic residual on the eastern seaboard amounted to 31.7 million barrels April through October for 1962, the latest period available, as compared with 32 million in the same period of 1961. Thus, there was an actual decline of only about 4.5 million barrels in domestic supply in the first 8 months, compared to a year ago. This means that there was a net increase in residual available to the east coast of about 12.5 million barrels during the first 8 months of this quota year.

Even in the face of these facts, the Department of Interior is now adding an additional 6.5 million barrels during the next 60 days. Under the already existing import levels, quotas for this quarter were 37½ percent of the year's total, or 770,830 barrels per day. This enormous increase, when added to existing quotas, means that import levels for the next 2 months will reach the astronomical figure of 878,000 barrels per day.

This is by far the highest level of imports ever recorded under the oil import control program. The previous record was 819,000 barrels daily reached for 1 month in January of 1962.

This further severe blow to the domestic coal industry came despite the fact that the Department of Interior officials admit no shortage of residual oil now exists on the east coast. A survey made this week by NCPC among trade sources in New York-New England area revealed that residual imports are selling well below posted prices and that oil is in plentiful supply.

Yet, in face of adequate supplies and a stable price, the import quota for residual oil was again increased—the third such increase since this administration assumed office 2 years ago and raising imports to 190 million barrels for the year as compared to 154 million barrels of allowable imports in 1960.

There would seem to be no other conclusion to draw than that under this administration the domestic coal industry is considered expendable.

Frankly, I campaigned with confidence and so stated publicly that if elected, President Kennedy would help the coal

regions. I still believe he is sincerely trying to do so.

I disagree with those Members of the administration who believe that relief, retraining, area development, public works or any other substitutes for a job can ever displace the need for the dignity that comes from a job that earns an honest living for an honest day's work.

The children of a working father, the wife of a working husband are entirely different people in the eyes of their loved ones, the eyes of their neighbors and in the community in which they live, than the unemployed, regardless of how worthy a cause his job was sacrificed to or for.

WELCOME PRESIDENT ROMULO BETANCOURT OF VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week President Kennedy told the Nation at his press conference:

I regard Latin America as the most critical area in the world today.

Certainly the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba is cause for grave concern. But the President, undoubtedly, also is preoccupied with the vast Latin American continent beyond the island of Cuba. Seething with social unrest and political instability, many of the Latin American Republics are prey to Communist subversion. Meanwhile, the Alliance for Progress has been disappointingly slow to alleviate those conditions which bar the great masses of Latin Americans from participation in the fruits of Western civilization.

Tomorrow Washington welcomes a gallant man from Venezuela, President Romulo Betancourt. President Betancourt has been fighting to bring to his nation the goals of the Alliance for Progress—social justice in a framework of political democracy.

In his struggle against tyranny Betancourt has known the terrors of the hunted man, separation from his loved ones, the bitterness of exile. As President of Venezuela, he has continued to endure great trials and personal sacrifice. All of us remember Trujillo's heinous attempt to assassinate him. Hardly a week goes by without a report of some effort to destroy confidence in Venezuela's democratic government. Sabotage of the oil wells, bombings of United States and Venezuelan business establishments, the theft of five art masterpieces, and that latest idiocy—the hijacking of a Venezuelan oil tanker on the high seas—all attest to the Castro-Communist determination to wreck democratic progress in Venezuela.

To Communist subversive activities are added constant efforts to discredit Betancourt on the part of the despots who formerly ran Venezuela as their personal fief. Unhappily, we have heard some of their propaganda repeated in this Chamber.

Fortunately, the free press in the United States reports the real state of affairs. I was particularly impressed by an editorial in this week's Life magazine, the issue of Ferbuary 22. As Life says, Romulo Betancourt "is a most welcome guest." I include Life's perceptive editorial at this point in the RECORD:

This week Kennedy welcomes to Washington quite a different sort of Latin American from Fidel Castro. In fact he is Castro's number one target, the President of Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt. Five years ago in Venezuela the Vice President of the United States and his wife were spat on by an angry mob. The Communists who led that mob found plenty of readymade tinder, compounded of jealousy, neglect and hatred of the recent 10-year Pérez Jiménez dictatorship. Last week Venezuelan Communists were still trying to mobilize a following with acts of terrorism. But the masses no longer respond. Of many reasons for this important change, not the least is Betancourt.

Betancourt spent most of his early adult years in jail, exile or the underground while Venezuela was run by military dictators. He nevertheless helped to found the first big modern political party in Venezuela, the Accion Democratica, whose peasants and workers made Betancourt president in the free election of 1958. Since then he has given Venezuela the longest and most successful constitutional government in its 142-year-old history. A year hence he has a good chance to fulfill his great ambition of turning over his office to a freely elected successor who can consolidate Venezuela's fledgling democracy.

Like other Latin American countries, Venezuela still has problems of poverty and ignorance. Unlike most, being the world's No. 1 oil exporter, Venezuela has the money to tackle them. But only since Betancourt has it shown the political guts and imagination to try. His government has approximately doubled the number of schools and students in 5 years, and raised the literacy rate around 50 to over 70 percent.. It has tried seriously to improve the lot of the campesinos with free land, better housing, loans and instructions. And it has helped the underprivileged without alienating the rapidly expanding business class or the still-potent army. Betancourt's stand against Castroism has been so courageous that the danger of a military coup, despite Communist provocation, grows smaller by the day. One of South America's most volatile countries has proved that democracy, given a chance, can be made to work.

That, of course, is the whole aim of the Alliance for Progress. The reason it is in trouble, according to one expert group, is that it has "lapsed into a unilateral U.S. checkwriting program." But Venezuelan leaders take its two-way nature seriously. They get some $100 million in Alliance loans for housing and rural improvement, but their own much larger contribution and initiative are what gives these programs life. Once considered the backwash of Spanish America, Venezuela is discovering it has many assets that can enable it to outgrow its dependence on oil, not least a mixed and lively population relatively unencumbered by feudal tradition. It also has Romulo Betancourt. As representative of a continent in which hope, progress and U.S. policy are very much in doubt, he is a most welcome guest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the welcome to President Betancourt, a courageous leader in the struggle for democracy. I am confident that even in his brief visit with us he will detect the great admiration of the American people for his contribution to the cause of freedom and democracy.

U.N. AGRICULTURAL AID TO CUBA

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that the United Nations has decided to grant agricultural aid to the Castro regime is unbelievable. Equally shocking is the statement of Paul G. Hoffman, Managing Director for the United Nations Special Fund which will supply the $1,500,000 of aid, where he says that not one American dollar will be used in this project. It is simply not correct to suggest that U.S. dollars will not be used when it is common knowledge that the United States provides 40 percent of the Special Fund's expenses. The American people will not and should not accept this double talk. The United States is paying for a major portion of the support of the United Nations. The United States will be making a contribution to this project whether direct or indirect, and this is intolerable.

To grant any amount of aid to the Communist nation that has confiscated more than $1 billion worth of American property and has not paid a cent in compensation is utterly unthinkable.

Mr. Speaker, while the subject of Cuba is under discussion, I wish to go on record as being in complete disagreement with the theory now apparently in vogue in administration circles that no one but the administration should discuss Cuba. In these days of managed news, I sincerely believe that it is the responsibility and duty of each citizen, and, particularly, each Member of Congress, to constructively discuss and, if necessary, as in this case, dare to criticize the decisions being made and carried out in our State Department by the administration. These men are not omniscient; their decisions are not sacrosanct.

This Nation is one of representative government, and as one Representative, I object to our financing anti-American policies. If this means that the Congress must cut off support for the Special Fund, then this must be done.

I have voiced my support of the United Nations in the past, as have the vast majority of Americans. However, this U.N. action demands a serious reappraisal of our role in the U.N. My deep concern has been voiced to the administration, and I sincerely hope that other Members of Congress will join in expressing their disapproval. Cuba today is a center for Communist subversive activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. Our every action must be to weaken communism in Cuba, not strengthen it.

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the future of the Alliance for Progress. So far there has been very little progress, and too little leadership from the United States. The program cannot be allowed to continue to flounder. The future of the Western Hemisphere is at stake.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a memorandum prepared by three members of the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress—COMAP: Emilio G. Collado, vice president and director, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank; and Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president, First National City Bank.

The authors call for a comprehensive reappraisal of the policies and actions that will help the Alliance for Progress to achieve its basic objectives. They urge that increased emphasis be placed on the "encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign." It is their further belief that:

The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

This is an important study and I hope that it receives the widest possible attention.

The text of the statement follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Last spring, the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP) was launched with a view to seeking ways in which American business could further the Alliance. A few days ago, the Chairman of the Committee—J. Peter Grace—submitted a report to the Commerce Department and to other agencies, recommending certain legislative proposals relating to the Alliance. The following memorandum sets out the observations and conclusions of three members of COMAP who, while agreeing with many of the points made in the Grace report feel that there are certain aspects of the problem which need a somewhat different emphasis. For this reason we feel justified in submitting a separate commentary.

"We have become increasingly concerned lest the Alliance for Progress fail to achieve its objectives for lack of a proper focus for its activities.

"As one illustration, the initial concept of COMAP's role appears to have been directed at finding ways to meet the Punta del Este program of $300 million a year of net new U.S. private investment in Latin America by devising short-range measures on the part of the United States to encourage such investment. If such measures would really get the Alliance off the ground, they might be justified. But we are disturbed by the feeling that even if such measures were taken, and were successful in inducing an expanded flow of U.S. investments into Latin America, the basic problem of making the area attractive to local savers and investors would remain. Indeed, such a program could do positive harm by making local governments feel even less urgency than they do now for achieving a proper investment climate.

"What is needed is a comprehensive reappraisal, not of the broad objectives of the Alliance for Progress, but of the policies and actions which will best achieve these objectives. The first year's operation of the Alliance saw heavy emphasis placed on government planning, government-to-government loans and grants, income redistribution through tax and land reform, public housing, and other social welfare measures. Many of these steps were commendable. Yet they were not in most cases accompanied by efforts to push through economic reforms which would encourage private initiative and enterprise. The continued outflow of private funds from Latin America is sufficient proof of the critical character of the current situation.

"Many countries in Latin America need social reforms as well as measures to provide greater equality of opportunity. However, these broad objectives cannot be achieved without a more rapid rate of economic advance than now is in prospect. And rapid economic growth cannot be achieved without greater emphasis on the private sector. The fact is that some 80 percent of Latin America's national income is today generated by private activities. Consequently, the Alliance for Progress can succeed if—and only if—it builds upon this base and places far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign.

"To reorient the Alliance for Progress in a direction which offers promise of achieving its objections involves difficult and sweeping economic reforms. Currencies need to be stabilized through measures to bring government budgets under control and to avoid inflationary increases in the supply of money and credit. Efforts along these lines could lead to the removal of the many exchange controls which still remain and which inhibit economic growth in many nations. At the same time, governments should act to remove the network of other controls which restrict enterprise and sustain local, high-cost monopolies. Economic growth, and the real benefits to all participants in the community which can accrue from growth, are maximized in an atmosphere of political and economic stability under which competitive private enterprise can thrive.

"In a very real sense, the Alliance for Progress is concerned with the age-old problem of trying to bake a bigger pie and divide the slices more evenly at the same time. The emphasis to date has been mostly on the side of slicing the pie. While such efforts may be desirable in the long run, the immediate effect has been to shrink the potential size of the pie. Experience around the world shows clearly that the national welfare is better served by far through policies which enlarge the entire pie.

"To accelerate economic advance in Latin America, efforts on many fronts will be required. Governments have important roles to play—in such areas as schools, health, farm extension services and roads. However, the overriding needs are for an increased flow of private capital from both local and foreign sources and for a significant and continuing improvement in the efficiency with which all resources, including most importantly human resources, are used.

"For these reasons, we urge that U.S. policies be reoriented to place far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private enterprise and investment. What has been done to date along these lines is simply not enough. The encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance. This would involve two major changes in U.S. policy.

"The first requirement is that the governments—and, as far as possible, the people—of Latin America know that the United States has changed its policy so as to put primary stress on improvement in the general business climate as a prerequisite for social development and reform. It must be made clear that U.S. policy in this hemisphere is based on the need for rapid economic growth and on the belief, confirmed by all available evidence, that this can be achieved within a reasonably free political framework only if private capital is given the opportunity to work in a favorable environment. This means that our policies should be consistent throughout the area and should discourage tendencies toward nationalization of industries and encourage setting up explicit rules which provide for truly reasonable indemnification where nationalization has taken place.

"In addition we should discourage policies which tend to distort normal economic relationships—policies leading to overvalued, and multivalued exchange systems, complex import controls with high and highly variable tariffs, quotas and other forms of trade restriction, price controls and highly unpredictable budgetary practice. In short, emphasis should be placed on creating an atmosphere in which private business planning can go on without undue concern about possible changes in the rules of the game. Countries following these policies should be given tangible and active support.

"To make this position clear and unambiguous, it would be necessary for the President to proclaim it in a major address in which he not only spells out the rationale behind the new policy, but also indicates the tools available to the United States to help make it effective. The most important of these tools would be the U.S. foreign aid program.

"A second requirement concerns a change in the criteria for granting aid. U.S. foreign aid policy is a branch of U.S. foreign policy, which should be directed toward achieving specific foreign policy goals. By and large it has not been effectively used for this purpose in Latin America. In its simplest terms, our goal in Latin America should be to help nations of the area grow economically while they retain internal political freedom, and thus remain part of the Western community of nations. Without economic growth the other goals will be much more difficult—if not impossible—to achieve. In order to get growth—which comes first both in time and in relation to goals involving redistribution of income—capital is needed. Most of this must come from internal sources. Thus, foreign aid should be used as an inducement to nations to adopt policies which will improve the business climate and thereby increase domestic savings and investments. The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate, and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

"The extent to which this policy would differ from the present one in Latin America can be seen by indicating what it would not involve:

"1. Unless there are overpowering political considerations, the United States would not lend money or make grants in countries which persist in policies which discourage private investment.

"2. The United States would not grant balance-of-payments loans of the bail-out variety though it should cooperate with the IMF on constructive balance-of-payments loans and stabilization programs.

"3. The United States would not provide foreign aid in such a way as to finance the expropriation of privately owned companies in any field of endeavor.

"On the positive side, the United States would seek opportunities to get individual

countries started toward rapid growth. Assistance on a relatively large scale would be focused in a few countries that appeared most likely to carry out measures needed to encourage investments and establish the widest area of economic freedom.

"Nowhere in the whole broad range of current economic problems is there one more compellingly significant for the United States than that of supporting the economic and social advance of our neighbors to the south.

"We are persuaded that the most important way in which the United States can help is by exporting the ideas implicit in a free economy. Certainly, money or goods alone will not do the job. Free enterprise is the basis of our own growth, and it provided the framework on which our social and political institutions, imperfect as they still are, have evolved. We feel certain that free enterprise can be the basis of growth in Latin America—indeed, that there is no known alternative that still permits a substantial measure of individual freedom.

"We also believe, however, that to encourage such an evolution in Latin America the United States must change its role—from one that emphasizes short run economic palliatives combined with recommendations for sweeping social and economic reforms to one that places the greatest emphasis on the longer-run goals of creating an environment in which freedom of the marketplace is recognized for what it is, a major pillar of free and prosperous societies.

"EMILIO G. COLLADO,
"Vice President and Director,
"Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.
"DAVID ROCKEFELLER,
"President,
"The Chase Manhattan Bank.
"WALTER B. WRISTON,
"Executive Vice President,
"First National City Bank."

THE CUBAN QUESTION

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, because of its importance I am today placing in the RECORD a column by Walter Lippmann entitled "On the Cuban Question Today." In the column Mr. Lippmann puts down his reasons for believing that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York, Senator KEATING, has won the right to be listened to. Mr. Lippmann states in his article that after too long a delay the administration finally did what it should have done in the beginning, which was to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA. Mr. Lippmann goes on and states that no matter what the consultation and exchange lead to he is not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out—by the administration—in September and October.

The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October—

States Mr. Lippmann.

Mr. Lippmann's article is timely and I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate:

ON THE CUBAN QUESTION TODAY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the past week the administration has gone to extraordinary lengths to win the country's confidence in the reliability of its information about the military situation in Cuba. Since the October confrontation there can, of course, be no lack of confidence in the President's courage and determination to protect American interests once the facts of a threat are established.

The crisis of confidence originates in what happened in the 6 weeks before the October confrontation. During the month of September and into October the administration was insisting that the Soviet Union had not brought offensive weapons into Cuba. Senator KEATING was insisting that they had. When he was found to have been right, there occurred a loss of confidence in the administration's intelligence services which it is still struggling to repair.

With others, I have had firsthand experience which enables me to understand how difficult it is to restore confidence once it has been shaken. On two occasions it was explained to me by high officials how reliable was our photographic surveillance of the island, and how certainly we could detect the exact nature of the weapons being installed in Cuba. These private explanations came after the President had said categorically in his press conference of September 13 that "these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of the hemisphere." Some 2 weeks later, on October 3, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, gave to a congressional committee a summary of the intelligence information which came from the CIA. The point of the summary was that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba.

But in fact there were. A week later, on October 10, Senator KEATING insisted that there were intermediate range missiles in Cuba, and 5 days later the President received the photographs which confirmed the charge.

This is how Senator KEATING won the right to be listened to, and this is why the administration has now, belatedly, made the right move, which is to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA.

This should put an end to the unseemly controversy about who is telling the truth between a Senator of the United States and the President of the United States. But I am not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out in September and October. The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October.

Examining the remarkable intelligence briefing by Mr. John Hughes of the Defense Department, I find myself quite convinced that our photographic intelligence is now reliable. But I am struck by the fact that there was a blank space in Mr. Hughes' testimony for the period from September 5 to October 14.

Photographs taken on August 29 of the San Cristobal area and on September 5 at Sagua la Grande show positively that no missile sites had been built. The next photograph referred to by Mr. Hughes is that of October 14. It shows intermediate range missile sites being erected. This is the photograph which precipitated the international crisis.

Where, we are bound to ask, was our photographic intelligence between September 5 and October 14? That was when the administration was telling the country that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba. This is the source of the infection which will have to be removed if full confidence is to be restored.

Having said this, I would say that there is no reason to doubt the thoroughness or the reliability of our photographic surveillance of Cuba and of the sea around it. The situation is extraordinary. We are depending on being able to fly daily photographic reconnaissance planes at high and low altitude. In Cuba there are a large number of the latest antiaircraft weapons manned by Soviet soldiers.

We may say, how come? Up to the present—knock on wood—the Soviet antiaircraft gunners are not attacking our reconnaissance planes. They must be under orders from Moscow where it is well known that if the planes were attacked there would be an immediate reprisal.

But where does this leave us? It leaves us with a fragile revised version of the original Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement. In the key letter of October 27, President Kennedy accepted the following terms of settlement: The U.S.S.R. would remove offensive weapon systems under United Nations observation and supervision. When this was done, the United States would end the quarantine and would give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. The U.S.S.R. removed the missiles, and the United States of America ended the quarantine. But Castro would not permit United Nations observers to come to Cuba, and consequently the United States would give no assurances against invasion.

What we have now is a substitute for the original agreement. We are able to carry on photographic reconnaissance without interference from the Soviet antiaircraft weapons. And Cuba is getting, in lieu of a U.S. guarantee against invasion, a buildup of its defensive capabilities. Both Moscow and Washington know that this strange working arrangement cannot be upset deliberately without bringing on a much mightier confrontation than that of last October.

CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES AND PUBLISHERS OF WEEKLY PAPERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving a congressional district in the Nation's Capital is the close relationship that a Congressman has with the publishers of weekly papers in his district.

During the past couple of years I have come to know and to admire the publisher of a small newspaper in Shoshone, Idaho—Herb Love.

This man can best be described by the inscription on a plaque recently presented to him by the Idaho Press Association which bestowed upon him the Master Editor-Publisher Award which is the highest honor the weekly press can bestow upon one of its members.

The inscription reads:

He has worked hard, lived honestly, thought soundly, influenced unselfishly, and is entitled to the highest honor in his profession.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the account of the awarding of this honor to Herb Love as it is reported in the Lincoln County Journal of January 17, 1963.

This excellent county paper is now being published by a young and energetic newspaperman, John George, who gives every indication of also becoming one of Idaho's outstanding weekly publishers.

The above-mentioned follows:

IDAHO'S HIGHEST JOURNALISM HONOR AWARDED TO EDITOR FROM SHOSHONE

The highest honor that the Idaho Press Association can bestow on one of its members, the Master Editor-Publisher Award, was presented to Herb. H. Love, Saturday night. The award crowns a journalistic career of 23 years.

Editors and publishers throughout Idaho, assembled at Hotel Boise for a banquet at the conclusion of their annual meeting, vigorously applauded their approval when the name of the winner was announced.

The honor is one that is not lightly given. Winners are determined by a selection committee of Idaho editors and publishers.

The inscription on the plaque presented Mr. Love sums up the devotion and talent he has given to journalism in these words: "He has worked hard, lived honorably, thought soundly, influenced unselfishly, and is entitled to the highest honor in his profession."

Lincoln County may well be proud of the man who has served them so well for the past 19 years.

Mr. Love was born in South Dakota and reared in Iowa. He attended Iowa State Teachers College and Iowa State College, earning his bachelor of arts degree from the teachers college in 1924. During World War I he served in the U.S. Navy.

The new master editor-publisher came to Idaho in 1925 to serve as superintendent of schools at Fairfield, a post he held for 2 years. He coached athletics at Hailey for a year, and was an instructor in the Wendell school for 2 years before leaving the teaching profession because of physical disability.

He married Helen Shuey of Wendell at Richfield in 1929. The couple have two children, a son, John, employed by Ball Products Co. of Boulder, Colo., and a daughter, Mrs. Judith Abraham, a student at Kansas City Art Institute.

From 1933 to 1944 Mr. Love was assessor of Gooding County, resigning in his sixth term to assume ownership of the Lincoln County Journal.

He founded the Gooding Independent in 1936 and owned the paper until 1940, at which time it was sold and merged with the Gooding Leader. He is a charter member of the Gooding Lions Club and served as its president just before coming to Shoshone.

Mr. Love was commander of the Shoshone American Legion Post in 1949, and was elected district commander in 1950. He is also a past president of the Shoshone Chamber of Commerce and the Shoshone Rotary Club. From 1955 to 1959 he served on the Shoshone City Council.

Mr. Love purchased the Journal from Glen Maxwell in May of 1944 and operated the paper for almost 19 years.

He was president of the Idaho Press Association in 1948, and was a director of the Idaho Newspaper Advertising Service for two terms before being elected president of that organization.

Mr. and Mrs. Love will remain in Shoshone, but plan an extended trip through Colorado, Texas, and Florida this winter.

GENERAL EXCELLENCE

The Lincoln County Journal was awarded first place for general excellence in its circulation bracket at the press association's annual convention in Boise last weekend. The Journal has now won the top award for 4 years in succession.

Contest judges were publishers and press association managers in Arizona, Montana, Nevada, and Washington.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the measure I am introducing today, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund, embodies the administration's program to further provide for the outdoor recreation needs of the Nation.

In his conservation message last year, President Kennedy warned that our present sources of recreation are not adequate to meet current demands. It is his view and mine that we must take positive action now, for as he wisely points out, "actions deferred are all too often opportunities lost, particularly in safeguarding our natural resources."

The legislation I am presenting today is a far-reaching proposal which provides for today's recreation needs while anticipating those of the near future. While the bill is fundamentally the same as the one submitted last year, the new version authorizes a program for 50 percent matching grants to the States for planning, and 30-percent grants for acquisition and development of needed outdoor recreation resources. The States will share the funds available in the following manner: one-fifth divided equally, three-fifths apportioned on the basis of population, and one-fifth allocated according to need.

In order for a State to qualify for assistance, it must have a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan, and the States are eligible to receive assistance in the preparation of such a plan and for the training of necessary personnel. Also, in anticipation of escalating prices for the future acquisition of land for recreational purposes, the bill limits expenditures for State development work for the next 10 years to 10 percent of the funds available for State assistance. The funds provided by this bill will also be available for acquisition of land and water which is authorized for areas of the national park system and areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior for outdoor recreation purposes; the national forest system; purposes of national areas for the preservation of species of fish or wildlife threatened with extinction; and incidental recreation purposes in connection with national fish and wildlife conservation areas as authorized by law.

Revenue sources provided by the bill include proceeds from entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges established by the President for Federal land and water areas; proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property; and the proceeds of the 4-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and special motor fuels used in motorboats. While the Treasury will hold a portion of these revenues for acquisition of additional lands at Federal and federally assisted projects, the greater portion would be used to help finance State and Federal programs.

For the purpose of assuring the financing of the program when the States are prepared for full participation, advance appropriations of $60 million a year for 8 years are authorized beginning with the third year, with provision for repayment from one-half of the revenues available to the fund. The fund will be used in the proportion of 60 percent for State purposes and 40 percent either way depending on need.

This measure is in complete accord with the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It is fiscally sound and forward looking. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that it will receive favorable action at this session of Congress and that the country will be able to realize its benefits in the near future.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, citizens of North Carolina and people across the Nation were saddened last Wednesday by the death of former U.S. Senator Robert Rice Reynolds at his home in Asheville, N.C.

Mr. Reynolds represented North Carolina in the U.S. Senate from 1933 until his retirement from the Senate in 1945. He ranks among the most colorful and controversial figures in American political history. He stormed Washington with a grandeur perhaps never to be duplicated. He was different and glamorous and those about him quickly realized it.

Perhaps no other U.S. Senator brought to Washington such a wide variety of experience as did Robert R. Reynolds. He had been a professional wrestler, a football coach, a war correspondent, an author, an actor, a motion-picture producer, and a criminal lawyer. He loved outdoor life and his earliest political campaigns were conducted traveling by horse in the North Carolina mountains.

His appearance in the Nation's Capital followed his famous campaign of 1932 which he launched with $20 and a T-model Ford purchased on the installment

plan. His majority in the election was one of the largest in North Carolina's history. He arrived in Washington in his "rusty and trusty" Ford and showed no hesitation in driving it to White House teas and other black tie occasions.

When he returned to North Carolina he stated that he had taken his faithful Ford to the Capital and parked it between two Cadillacs in a million-dollar garage which Mr. Hoover had built and that it rolled its mud-splattered eyes around and looked up at him and said: "Bob, ain't we in society now."

Bob Reynolds' stories, similar to the one above, are told all over North Carolina. They are told here in Washington. He will be remembered as a legendary son of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Affectionately known as "Our Bob" by friends back home and sometimes referred to as "Buncombe Bob," Senator Reynolds was the founder of the American Nationalist Party in 1941 and rose to the chairmanship of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

A great deal more could be said about the accomplishments and activities and controversies of Senator Reynolds as a Member of Congress, but I wish to touch briefly on the human qualities of this foremost American citizen.

He was sincerely concerned for the people he represented. His personality was magnetic; his charm, warm and abiding. Perhaps his greatest attribute, however, was that he never forgot his friends.

His rich personality, keen sense of humor, and loyalty to his friends endeared him to the people of North Carolina.

Bob Reynolds loved life and he lived it fully.

PANAMA CANAL PROCRASTINATION PERILOUS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been aptly stated that the history of the Panama Canal is one of continuing crises. Those of key character concern the best site and the best type, known as the battle of routes and battle of the levels. Moreover, this pattern of struggle reappears periodically, and since 1947 the question of the proper modernization of the Panama Canal has been beset with repetitions of these old controversies in slightly modified forms.

Over a period of years, a number of Members of the Congress, several in the House but only one in the Senate, who have made serious studies of the canal question and recognized its magnitude, have introduced bills to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission. In so doing, it was their purpose to provide an effective agency to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal policy, which the Congress and the Nation can accept and which time and usage will justify.

Unfortunately, this task has been complicated immeasurably by the ratification in 1955 of a secretly contrived canal treaty between the United States and Panama and by the nationalization in 1956 of the Suez Canal by Egypt. Despite the inherent differences between the juridical foundations of the two interoceanic canals, this action by Egypt served to evoke a chain of aggressive nationalistic and communistic revolutionary inspired agitations in Panama, some of them marked by mob violence led by well-trained leaders. The long-range objectives of this revolutionary movement is the wresting of the sovereign control of the Panama Canal from the United States and the extortion of greater benefits from the toll revenues. The only basis for such aims is that inherent in Panama's geographical location, which is adjacent to the Canal Zone territory. The difficulties of securing increased transit capacity have now become severely aggravated by the necessity for safeguarding the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

As a start in this direction, I made a series of major addresses in the House beginning in 1957 and continuing up to the present Congress. These included, in comprehensive detail, the diplomatic and legislative history of the acquisition by the United States in 1904 of our territorial possession known as the Panama Canal Zone.

Though these efforts were generally ignored in the mass news media of the United States or, when presented, had their meaning distorted, they were prominently featured in the press of Panama, especially in the Spanish language papers, which I follow closely. Through the latter, they have produced echoes from various countries of Latin America.

The failure on the part of elements in our Department of State to stop the depredations of isthmian agitators by means of forthright declarations of U.S. policy, in the course of time, has led to a chain of diplomatic victories by Panama, making the United States a laughing stock in the Western Hemisphere. So confident did anti-U.S. extremists become that the Panamanian National Assembly even attempted to encircle the Canal Zone by enacting legislation extending the 3-mile limit to 12 miles, with Panama controlling the water at each end of the zone's 3-mile limit, which could have made that waterway another Berlin. This attempt, our Government very promptly and properly refused to recognize, but friction resulted.

The radical leadership in the Panama National Assembly, which includes some Marxist-Leninists, obviously understood the significance of my researches in the exposure of their schemes and did not stop with the attempted encirclement of the Canal Zone. It followed up by giving me the unique distinction of being formally declared as public enemy No. 1 of Panama.

The situation on the isthmus was worsened on September 17, 1960, when the President of the United States, in a mistaken gesture of friendship, by an Executive order soon after the adjournment of the Congress, directed the formal display of the Panamanian flag outside the flag of the United States at one place in the Canal Zone as evidence of a so-called titular sovereignty of Panama over the zone. This unfortunate precedent of striking the American flag in the Canal Zone, as predicted by me on the floor of the House, merely served to open the door, for in Panama and elsewhere, the action was interpreted as a belated United States recognition of Panamanian sovereignty.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would invite attention to the fact that on February 2, 1960, after full debate, the House of Representatives approved House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, against such display by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, which was transmitted to the Senate but, for reasons not published, was never acted upon by that body. In addition, the Congress passed the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce Appropriations Act prohibiting the expenditure of funds embraced in the act for such purpose. No wonder isthmian extremists became emboldened and arrogant.

Under these circumstances, the necessity for an effective counterpoise to Panama became clearly evident. This compensating force developed in the form of growing demands for a second canal at Nicaragua, the ancient rival of the Panamanian site, and elsewhere. In an address to the House on June 30, 1960, I undertook to give a comprehensive description of the Nicaraguan project, which was largely based on a 1931 report—House Document No. 139, 72d Congress—and to advocate its consideration. The second canal idea, thus stimulated, served as an antidote for Castroism in Panama and to still some of the violent anti-American agitations among its radical elements. This address, moreover, supplies significant background information on the interoceanic canal picture, in which the Nicaraguan idea has a history of over four centuries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for more than 30 years our country has witnessed a frustrating succession of administratively dominated, ex parte investigations and reports concerning increased interoceanic canal transit facilities, often directed by those who, directly or indirectly, would benefit from their own recommendations. The prime illustration of such procedure was the ill-fated 1939 project for a third set of larger locks at Panama. This construction effort, launched under congressional authorization on administrative recommendations, was suspended in 1942 after an expenditure of some $75 million of the taxpayers' money, mainly on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores. It is fortunate that no excavation was started at Pedro Miguel. Had such an engineering fiasco been brought about by civilian engineers they would have been crucified.

After suspension of construction on this project, a number of independent engineers and others studied its planning and learned that no adequate investigation of it had been made prior to submission to the Congress. Such failure is difficult to comprehend.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that Members of the Congress, when visiting the Canal Zone, inquire into significant phases of the third locks project history and inspect the channel layout as then planned by personal observations around the Miraflores Lake area, as other Members of the Congress and myself have done. But, unless the project is studied in advance of such inspection and understood, there will be no point in making a field exploration of it.

It is interesting to note also that an undisclosed objective of the third locks program was conversion of the Panama Canal to sea level, according to a plan which had likewise not been adequately studied, and that completion of the third locks project would not only have resulted in creation of a navigational monstrosity at the Pacific end of the canal, but as well would have committed our country to a serpentine sea-level undertaking that would have been a navigational nightmare. Moreover, all of this resulted from a formal inquiry by routine administrators pursuant to Public Resolution No. 85, 74th Congress, approved May 1, 1936, and without adequate hearings or debate by the Congress—House Document No. 210, 76th Congress, and Public Law 391, 76th Congress.

The great questions in the canal problem are:

First. Safeguarding the untrammeled sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone territory, without which the canal cannot be operated.

Second. The major operational improvement and increase of capacity of the Panama Canal by the elimination of the bottleneck locks at Pedro Miguel, the consolidation of all Pacific locks in new three-lift structures near Aguadulce to correspond with the lock arrangement at Gatun, and raising the Miraflores Lake level to that of Gatun Lake to form a summit anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match that at the Atlantic end. This program would also include one set of larger parallel locks for larger vessels and raise the summit lake level from its present height of 85 to 92 feet.

Third. The question of a second canal, at Panama, Nicaragua, Colombia, or elsewhere, in an area that extends from Tehuantepec to the region of the Atrato, of whatever type that supplies the best conditions for transit at least cost.

In these connections, Mr. Speaker, I would invite attention to the fact that in 1944, when the initial recommendation for the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks was submitted to the Secretary of War, the then Governor of the Canal Zone warned that advocates of a so-called sea level canal at Panama would oppose "unjustifiably" any major change in the existing waterway on the ground that such improvement would delay its conversion to one at sea level—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 21, 1956, statement of Senator Thomas E. Martin. This, Mr. Speaker, is no real reason at all. Nevertheless, the then Governor's warning has been more than justified by sea level advocates who have not only opposed any major improvement of the existing canal, but also have prevented an adequate study of it and have failed to present any information concerning the inevitable indemnity and increased annuities involved, or even to mention the subject. Furthermore, it is indeed remarkable that these insistent advocates, some of whom have been in positions of authority, have unfailingly endeavored to conceal important facts and consequences to arise, and have striven to commit our Government to an unnecessary venture that would overnight plunge us into a measureless sea of extravagance and diplomatic turmoil. All of this could be, and would be, obviated by the major improvement of the existing canal by means of a third locks project, modified to include the reconstruction of the Pacific end of the canal. Moreover, such major improvement would not require a new treaty with Panama, or a new indemnity, which is a matter of paramount importance and has been, and still is, consistently ignored by sea level advocates.

More than two decades have passed since suspension of the Third Locks project. Traffic has continued to grow, making action more urgent. Certainly, the time for permitting further procrastination on the part of administrative officials in coming to a wise decision is now over.

In determining our country's attitude on this vital question, all the pertinent facts must be considered and met—not concealed as has been done on more than one occasion. To decide upon matters of such magnitude in a purely routine, administrative manner is absolutely shocking and has been repeatedly shown to have been counter to the best interests of the United States and the world at large.

Transcendent among the many considerations that enter into the Panama Canal picture is that of the Pandora's Box of diplomatic difficulty that would be involved in the adoption of the so-called sea-level project for that waterway. This plan would open up the entire treaty situation and make the United States a target for political blackmail in the way of vast indemnity and annuity costs as well as risk of the final liquidation of our sovereign rights, power, and authority over the canal enterprise. No wonder Panamanian politicians and others who would benefit have overtly and covertly sought its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a dastardly outrage that attempts should be made to settle these grave questions as casual routine matters, withholding significant facts from the people of our Nation, and bypassing the Congress and the President. Every consideration demands action by the Congress.

To this end, I have introduced H.R. 3858 to create a competent, objective, and independent Interoceanic Canals Commission, charged with broad authorities for making the necessary studies and reports touching on this matter of increased interoceanic transit facilities, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; and eight members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as are made the original appointments. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $25,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States $22,500 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(a) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks Project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(b) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(c) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(d) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(e) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(f) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later

than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(a) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(b) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final reports; and

(c) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a (1946 edition); and may make such expenditures—including those for actual travel and subsistence of members of the Commission and its employees—not exceeding $13 for subsistence expense for any one person for any calendar day; for rent of quarters at the seat of Government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in northeastern Europe some 3 million Lithuanians constitute one of the smallest national groups. In the course of their turbulent history they had generally managed to safeguard their freedom. But in the late 18th century the powerful Russian advance had overwhelmed them; their country became part of the Russian empire and they lived under the czarist regime until the Russian Revolution in 1917. Then, when that autocratic regime was toppled, they proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918, and established the Lithuanian Republic. This small but vigorous and progressive Republic was doing well, and the Lithuanians were among Europe's most enlightened people but in 1940 the Soviet Government treacherously put an end to the Lithuanian Republic and annexed the country.

Since then these unhappy Lithuanians have been suffering under Soviet totalitarian tyranny. Today their lot under the Kremlin is tragic. They are deprived of their freedoms and are deliberately cut off from the free world. But they have not weakened in their fight for freedom, and on the 45th anniversary of their independence day we wish more power to them.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement in favor of legislation to amend and improve the operation of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 which I am today introducing in the House.

At the risk of uttering a very bad pun, I would say that this bill is designed to put a little more heart into the immigration law. I think this law can use it.

The purpose of the bill is limited to changing the immigration quota provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. It proposes a substitute quota system for the present system based on national origins.

Mr. Speaker, the national origins quota system has been criticized for its features of racial discrimination for many years. These criticisms, in my opinion, have had substance and I feel that if a workable substitute can be found—one that will fulfill our own national goals without giving offense to other countries of the world—then such a substitute should be adopted.

The national origins quota system is based upon a belief that the people of one nationality or race are superior to those of another. Most Americans would agree, I am sure, that such a belief, however popular it once might have been, has no place in the laws of our Nation today.

It is no secret that when the first permanent immigration quota law was adopted in 1924 it was purposely designed to curtail the "new immigration" from southern and eastern Europe while not interfering with the "old immigration" from northern and western Europe. This is apparent when one merely examines what the quotas are.

Great Britain, for example, has an annual quota of over 65,000—more than one-third of the total quotas of all the countries of the world, most of which goes unused every year. Germany and Ireland also have liberal quotas, reflecting the many early settlers in the American colonies and in the United States from those countries. At the same time, a country like Greece whose immigration quota is oversubscribed by some 105,000 visa applications, has a quota of 308.

Thus we have a situation in which the immigration quotas allotted to certain countries are larger than they can use, while other countries are given quotas which are paltry in relation to their needs. And all of this is determined by the accidents of history—which countries had contributed the most stock to the U.S. population as it existed in the year 1920. Surely, some more equitable means of allocating our immigration quotas can be found than this.

I think that my bill offers a reasonable alternative to the present system and is certainly to be preferred to it.

My bill provides a new means of allocating the immigration quotas based in part on comparative populations of foreign countries and in part upon the proportion of immigration into the United States from the various countries during recent years.

Under the bill the total worldwide immigration quota would be set at 250,000 immigrants a year. Under the present law it is around 157,000 and varies from time to time with changes in the number of individual quota areas that are recognized. Of the 250,000 total, 50,000 would be set aside for use by refugees and escapees without regard to the quota areas from which they come. In the light of recent experience I would not expect to see anything close to the full amount of these refugee visas utilized very often.

The remaining 200,000 visas would be allocated under a two-part formula. Eighty thousand of these would be apportioned in accordance with the proportionate populations of the countries of the world, no one country to receive more than 3,000 visas under this provision. The other 120,000 quota visas would be allocated in accordance with the proportionate immigration from the various countries of the world during the past 15 years.

Under the revised allocation, Italy's quota would be increased from the present 5,666 to 15,648. Greece, whose current quota is only 308, would receive 3,458.

Quotas would be revised every 5 years. The maximum quota for any country would be 25,000 and the minimum raised from 100 to 200. Within these limits there is a guarantee that no country would receive a smaller quota than it receives under the present law.

These provisions then furnish the basis for dividing the quota among the quota areas of the world. There are other changes affecting the distribution of quota visas within the quota areas. Persons of special skills and parents of U.S. citizens, both of whom are in preference categories under present quotas, would be made nonquota immigrants under the bill.

The extent to which the United States has benefited from the admission of trained and educated immigrants is not generally recognized. More than a quarter of a million of the immigrants who

reported their occupation during the 1947–61 period were in the professional and technical categories for which we have a critical need. As pointed out in a most useful report by Mr. Frank L. Mott, Division of Manpower, Requirements and Resources, Department of Labor, November 20, 1962:

> The training of professional and technical workers represents a heavy economic investment for the people of a country. As indicated earlier, many immigrants are fully trained when they arrive. The receiving country benefits from the education and training which were acquired in the country of the immigrant's origin. Thus, the United States received immigrants who brought with them not only a willingness to work but a diversified knowledge, education, and training which were needed throughout the economy.

The United States has reaped manifold gains from the admission of immigrants whose skills and experience enable them to make a vital contribution to our Nation's growth.

Surely, there is no need to justify elimination of the inequities in our immigration law that prevent the unification of families. The grief and hardship incurred under the present harsh restrictions would be eradicated under the provisions of my bill. Simple humanity dictates the need for this change.

The bill also eliminates the extremely discriminatory provisions relating to the Asia-Pacific triangle which require a person, one of whose parents is of a race attributable to an area within the Asia-Pacific triangle, to come under an Asia-Pacific quota rather than the quota of his native country.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of pious talk about changing our immigration quota system. The time has long since passed when we should have had some legislative action on these proposals. I was encouraged by the President's remarks at his January 24 press conference that the administration is planning to offer recommendations for legislation in this area. With the added support of the administration, prospects for action have brightened considerably. I urge that Congress give priority to the long-overdue enactment of an immigration policy that will be fair to all.

PROPOSED MILITARY PAY LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of many, one of the most significant pieces of legislation with which we will be called upon to deal in the 1st session of the 88th Congress is the military pay raise bill, endorsed by President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara. I would like to place myself on record as among those who will firmly support this legislation.

Four and one-half years have gone by since the last adjustment of military pay.

Our military men wear their uniforms with pride. They serve their country with valor and devotion during both peace and war—such is their role in the national defense. As Members of Congress, one of our roles in the national defense is to provide just, adequate compensation and career incentives for our Armed Forces.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that provision for increased military pay is a matter of economic justice. As Secretary of Defense McNamara recently stated:

> In the interim [i.e., since the 1958 Military Pay Act], some erosion has taken place in the real value of compensation of the military and there has been a substantial loss relative to the wage and salary gains of wage earners in the civilian economy.

The value of military pay has been eroded by the steady increase in the cost of living. From 1958 to date the Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Department of Labor rose 5 percent.

Similarly, during the same period, average weekly wages in manufacturing industries registered gains of almost 18.5 percent, and average salaries of Federal civil servants advanced by slightly more than 13 percent.

To make the comparison between military and civilian pay scales even more graphic, let me cite the following statistics.

A police patrolman or a fireman in New York City receives a beginning salary of $5,600 a year.

A civilian machinist in a naval shipyard receives $6,700 annually after 5 years in his trade.

A chief petty officer in the Navy with 20 years of experience is paid a basic salary of $4,200 a year. If he is married, has two children, and is ashore, his income is $5,670, or less than the lowest paid truckdriver in a large city.

And a master sergeant, with 30 years' service and quartered in the barracks, earns approximately $4,300 a year.

It is true, of course, that all military personnel receive retirement and medical benefits. So do the policemen, the firemen, and most industrial employees.

It is high time that such economic injustices are corrected.

Furtherfore, the proposed boost in military pay would inject more than $1.7 billion into the economy. Such a potential increase in consumer spending power would do much toward creating an additional demand for goods and services which, in turn, would help to reduce current unemployment of almost 4 million—at an annual rate.

I believe that the military pay legislation introduced into both Houses during this 1st session of the 88th Congress, and now under consideration by the House and Senate Armed Services Committee is a step in the right direction. By raising salaries of the military forces to reflect at least in part the advances of the civil economy over the past 4½ years, by improving certain categories of compensation in terms of service uniformity and need, by providing incentives designed to overcome service manning and retention problems, and by adjustments in the pay of retired personnel, this proposed measure would correct certain existing inequities in the pay scale sales of our Armed Forces.

It is my hope and conviction that the Congress will act promptly and favorably upon this proposed Military Pay Act of 1963.

OUR ARTICLES OF FAITH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, a free and responsible press is vital to the continued well-being of our democratic institutions. That great sculptor of our Bill of Rights, Thomas Jefferson, declared in 1787:

> The way to prevent these irregular interpositions of the people is to give them full information of their affairs through the channel of the public papers, and to contrive that those papers should penetrate the whole mass of the people. The basis of our governments being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

Later, Jefferson was to become an articulate critic of the press and its abdication of responsibility. But he remained a steadfast defender of press freedom. He said:

> Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.

In these days when our people are besieged by a mass of information from the public media, it is reassuring to us all that most segments of the press respect the obligation to responsibility with which they exercise the constitutional right of freedom. I am always gratified to see an expression by a newspaper editor of his faith in the American system and a declaration of the sense of duty with which he serves his readers.

One of the best expressions of this sort I have seen recently appeared in the editorial columns of a newspaper in my district, the Canadian Record of Canadian, Tex. The editor of that fine weekly newspaper, Mr. Ben R. Ezzell, has the following words to say in an editorial entitled "Our Articles of Faith":

> OUR ARTICLES OF FAITH
>
> At this, the beginning of a new year, we want to reaffirm our statement of policy, our pledge of service to our community and our country and our faith in them—an affirmation which appeared in these columns when the Record first came under its present management more than a decade ago, and one which has been restated at intervals since that time.
>
> These are the principles on which this newspaper is operated:
>
> We believe in the freedom of the press. We are grateful for it. We will defend it to the limit of our ability.

We believe, too, that in return for that freedom, we owe an obligation of service to our community. We believe that it is our duty to provide you with complete and unbiased reporting of the news of our community.

We will strive always for accuracy—and being human, we will not always achieve it. But we pledge to you that we will never knowingly mislead you—and we will never refuse to make correction if any error in fact is called to our attention.

We will do our best to keep you informed regarding the public affairs of our community, because we believe that an informed public is our best guarantee of freedom.

We will strive always to base our reporting of the news on fact, and to confine our own opinions and comments on it to our editorial columns. We will continue to present our own views on public questions, editorially, as clearly and concisely as possible because we believe that you have a right to know where your newspaper stands on any public question.

At the same time, we will not deny you, as individuals, the right to public expression of your own views whether your ideas agree with ours or not. As always, the columns of the Record will be open to you for publication, over your signature, of your own views on questions of public interest subject only to the restrictions of libel and the standards of common decency.

But we will neither publish nor acknowledge unsigned and anonymous communications, regardless of their content.

The Record is a private company, operated for private profit. But it is a public news medium and as such, we hope that it merits, and will continue to merit, your confidence and your trust.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WYMAN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, for 1 hour, on Thursday, February 21, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROUSH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.

Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. HORTON.

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

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. BRAY.

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

Mr. DENT.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. HAYS.

Mr. BURKE.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; according (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

416. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 involving decreases in the amount of $70 million for the Small Business Administration and $4,625,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. 70); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

417. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 1, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 21, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

418. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

419. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

420. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the Executive Stockpile Committee's report to the President on disposing of excess stockpile materials; to the Committee on Armed Services.

421. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

422. A letter from the Acting Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department of the Navy's semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over for the period July 1 to December 31, 1962, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, second 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

423. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress, and with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

424. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

425. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

426. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

427. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of license fees being charged the U.S. Government for the right to produce the SS–11 antitank guided missile mutually developed by France and the United States under the mutual weapons development program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

428. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the failure of the Department of the Navy to use its excess spare parts and assemblies in the production of Navy aircraft; to the Committee on Government Operations.

429. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 50th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

430. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 48th Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

431. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on blacklog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

432. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

433. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave 'B' Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino, Calif., for defense purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

434. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

435. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas"; to the Committee on Public Works.

436. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 27, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Bass Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Licking Valley Local School District, Licking County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3845. A bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3846. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreational demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 3847. A bill to provide that U.S. payments to the United Nations shall not be used for programs contrary to the policies of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3848. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 3849. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 3850. A bill to establish an additional office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3851. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3852. A bill to provide certain mileage allowances for Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3853. A bill to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish and spawning area in the Salmon River, Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3854. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 3855. A bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 3856. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3857. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits in certain cases for brothers, sisters, and other relatives, of individuals who die fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3858. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3859. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Commission on Governmental Operations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3860. A bill to provide for the observance of the 19th day of November 1963, the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 3861. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 3862. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 3863. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3864. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and the needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 3865. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3866. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 to clarify the projects to be subject to certain amendments made by that section to the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3867. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the retailers excise tax on jewelry in the case of identification tags designed primarily to indicate emergency medical data concerning the wearer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3869. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3870. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3871. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreational demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 3872. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3873. A bill to amend section 322 of the Public Health Service Act to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 3874. A bill to extend the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend section 501(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require evidence of financial responsibility in connection with the registration of certain aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3876. A bill to amend section 307(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to prescribe air traffic rules governing the use of landing areas by certain aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3877. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish liability on the part of the United States for the taking of easements in the navigable airspace of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 3878. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3879. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3880. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 3881. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 3882. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreational demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3883. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreational demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3884. A bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 3885. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 to clarify the projects to be subject to certain amendments made by that section to the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3886. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to establish a 35-hour workweek for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 3887. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3888. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection in the case of veterans suffering from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis developing a 10 percent degree of disability within 7 years from the date of discharge or release; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to benefits available to certain paralyzed veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 3890. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend for 2 years the provisions thereof which would otherwise expire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to provide a credit against the individual income tax for individuals who make contributions or gifts to the United Nations or its specialized agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.J. Res 254. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to provide that if the United Nations furnishes any further assistance to Cuba, the United States shall not thereafter make any contributions or payments to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Res. 258. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Res. 259. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting early action be taken to implement the change of name from Bruces Eddy to Henry Dworshak Dam, as a fitting memorial to the distinguished late Senator Henry Dworshak; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging Congress to continue support of the tobacco research program at the Agricultural Science Center of the University of Kentucky; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation to authorize and make appropriations to reconstruct the Grays Harbor South Jetty, which has increasingly deteriorated, to breakwater standards; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation pertaining to urban renewal and low rent housing, school construction appropriation, power facilities appropriation, and authorization for loans to the government of Guam and loan revolving fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Capt. Lloyd N. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 3894. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Kioumourtzoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 3895. A bill for the relief of Antonios Giannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Pablo T. Rinonos and Tomasa A. Rinonos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3897. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Antonio Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3898. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ellis Beckles and Vida Bernese Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3899. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain portions of railroad rights-of-way and station sites on public lands to the lessees thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3900. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Central Pacific Railway Co. and the Southern Pacific Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3901. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Southern Pacific Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3902. A bill for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3903. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Quintos Marcelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bernardino D. Marcelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 3905. A bill for the relief of Dr. Catalina Lee Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3906. A bill for the relief of Law For Wing, Law Wan Koon Dai, Law Yee Lan, and Law Yee Ping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 3907. A bill for the relief of Maj. Lawrence W. Hunt; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3908. A bill for the relief of Chang Sheng also known as Rafael Chang Sing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3909. A bill for the relief of Morice E. Ovadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 3910. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liu Chung Hao, her daughter, Tien Yee (Christina) Hao, and her son, Tien Shou (Terence) Hao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 3911. A bill for the relief of William Lusk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 3912. A bill for the relief of George A. Simmons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

42. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of residents of Sioux County, Iowa, calling upon 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.

43. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of 49 students of Ladycliff College, Highland Falls, N.Y., to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

44. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Walter F. Glace and 32 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

45. Also, petition of Walter D. Van Etten and 30 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

46. By Mr. TEAGUE of California: Petition of certain citizens of the 13th Congressional District of California to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

47. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of County Commissioners, Phillips County, Malta, Mont., petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to opposing a game refuge area in the southern part of Phillips County, Mont., to be known as the Fort Hawley project, and requesting support for public hearings thereon; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

48. Also, petition of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the abolishment of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and transfer the functions of the committee to a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara Speak on the Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban situation continues to be of concern to Members of Congress and to the Nation as a whole. In this conection, in my weekly newsletter to the people of the Fourth District of Tennessee, I have discussed the Cuban situation and recent developments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my newsletter be reprinted in the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Cuba and its Communist government continue to be the subject of great public interest and concern as the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense this week made statements on our Cuban policy.

The President has taken a firm stand on Cuba. Last October when it became known that Russian weapons designed primarily for offensive purposes had been landed in Cuba and were being deployed, the President ordered a naval blockade of Cuba and demanded that they be withdrawn. These missiles and bombers were dismantled and removed from Cuba.

Since this time the United States has continued our air surveillance of the island with both low-flying aircraft and with high-altitude planes of the U–2 design.

Recently, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in a lengthy report, told the American people that since July 1 of last year more than 400 reconnaissance flights have been flown over Cuba by our U.S. military aircraft and that the photographs taken on these flights, plus other intelligence sources, indicate clearly that the offensive weapons have been removed from Cuba.

In addition to Secretary of Defense McNamara, President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Mr. John McCone, Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, have all stated quite positively that, while we are concerned, they are satisfied that Cuba no longer poses a real military threat to the United States or to other countries in this hemisphere.

In a further action directed against Cuba, President Kennedy has ordered recently a further crackdown on Cuban shipping which will further shrink the already substantially reduced trade with Cuba from the free world.

While partisan attacks are continually being made on the administration because of our Cuban policy, the President has taken a firm stand and is working to strengthen our position while also working toward the removal of all Soviet troops from Cuba—this short of war. In international affairs we generally tend to close ranks at the water's edge, and follow a bipartisan policy of cooperation, however some would use the Cuban situation for partisan attacks and political gain.

Secretary Rusk in a major speech this week in California called for an early withdrawal of the remaining Soviet troops in Cuba and said that the administration is working toward having these troops removed.

"The authorities in Moscow and Havana must recognize that Soviet military elements in Cuba do not insure the peace of Cuba, but poison the atmosphere and increase the dangers," Rusk said. "The sooner this source of potential trouble is eliminated, the better for everyone concerned."

"We in the Western Hemisphere cannot accept as normal any Soviet military presence in this hemisphere," the Secretary said. He asserted that Cuba will not become a base for offensive military operations against the United States or other countries and pledged "the Armed Forces of the United States" to maintain this position.

Wall Map of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a concurrent resolution today which, if approved by both Houses, will authorize the printing of 59,350 copies of a wall map of the United States. These maps would be prepared cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management and Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior. Its information would also include historical data, concerning public surveys, reservations, and other appropriate dedications of land of the United States. There will be made available 43,900 copies for distribution by Members of the House of Representatives, and 15,450 for Members of the Senate. The primary purpose of this resolution is to effect the congressional-type distribution on a single-sheet map. In a similar resolution approved in the 87th Congress, the dimensions of the map were larger than requested in this proposal and necessitated the use of two sheets which had to be pasted together to effect a complete map. Because of the desire of many Members to have the single-sheet type, with the information I have described, I am requesting that the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 574—87th Congress—be suspended. I have written to Secretary Udall about our desires in this matter, and if and when the Congress approves this resolution, I am advised that the Department can begin processing and printing of this important, informative map to satisfy requests of all Members for its need.

Tides of Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, I had the privilege of speaking before the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York, on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuanian Independence Day falls between Lincoln's and Washington's Birthdays, and should be remembered by all Americans as an occasion when people in another land proclaimed their independence from oppression and tyranny.

In my remarks, I tried to outline some aspects of Lithuanian history and to describe their long struggle for independence. This history will be interesting to my colleagues:

TIDES OF TYRANNY

(By Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY)

For those of us gathered here today and for the more than 2 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, February 16 is indeed a historic occasion, a date which celebrates heroism in the past, and which symbolizes hope for the future. For 45 years Lithuanians, wherever they might be, have together recalled with patriotic pride that day in 1918 when individual valor brought national victory to a small but ancient land long dominated by despicable despotism. In view of the significance of that day and the solemnity of this occasion, it is indeed a distinct honor for me to join with you in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

The tyranny which enslaves Lithuania today completely overshadows the tyranny which oppressed that country in the past. But we should not forget that the heroic history of Lithuania is at the same time a tragic epic of foreign aggressions repeated so often that, when we consider this history, we might well speak of the incessant "tides of tyranny." February 16, 1918, marks the greatest chapter in this saga, a chapter in which those evil tides emerged from beneath the oppressive waters of tyranny. Today I propose to review briefly this epic struggle of Lithuania to maintain her identity and to defend her independence against centuries of aggression and oppression. Only when we recall these centuries of struggle which produced the victory of 1918, only then do we recognize the full significance

of February 16. And only then can we realize the magnitude of the tremendous task which is ours today, the task of turning back and stemming forever these "tides of tyranny."

Lithuania is endowed with two fatal attractions: strategic location and natural wealth. Situated on the shores of the Baltic midway between Berlin and Moscow, Lithuania is a rich land of farms, forests, and lakes—more than 2,000 of them I understand. The very first mention of Lithuania in recorded history—made by Tacitus, the famous Roman historian—was in praise of Lithuanian farming. The fertile soil, the timber, the outlet on the Baltic—each was by itself treasure enough to motivate foreign aggression against Lithuania.

The primary perpetrator of such aggression has always been and remains today just one country: Russia. Long before the Lithuanian tribes were forged into one nation the country was struggling against domination by its Russian neighbors from the east. Finally in the 14th century the people of Lithuania began to turn back these early waves of aggression, waves which were but an ominous warning of later tides to come.

By the end of the 14th century, Lithuania had driven the Russians back to Moscow and had secured for itself the power necessary to protect its territories and traditions. Following the dynastic union with Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a marvelous and mighty state stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north to the Black Sea in the south. Within these boundaries the old and rich culture of the Lithuanian people attained brilliant heights, heights which it would attain again only after similar suffering and struggle. This comparative calm, this peaceful prosperity lasted little more than a century.

By 1500 the Russian tide had ebbed and was now again sweeping back across the northern and central plains of Europe. For 40 of the 90 years between 1492 and 1582 Lithuania found itself at war with the Muscovite aggressors. The czars alleged that Russia desired only an outlet on the Baltic Sea; however, after Peter the Great had taken Riga from Sweden and had built his own window on the Baltic at St. Petersburg, the Russian rulers showed that their appetite for aggression was far from satisfied.

In 1795 this aggression came quickly and brutally to the surface: the shameful third partition of Poland also became the fateful third of our many tides of tyranny, tyranny which was to now completely engulf Lithuania and enslave its people for 123 years.

Not that the people of Lithuania willingly or weakly succumbed to such oppression. Throughout the course of their long history they have fought fiercely to overthrow the repressive rule of the ruthless Russian czars. In 1812 Lithuania experienced a mere moment of relative freedom as Napoleon advanced against Moscow. The fate of that historic campaign has been recorded with stark simplicity upon a monument which still stands in Vilnius. On one side the inscription reads "Napoleon Bonaparte passed this way in 1812 with 400,000 men"; on the other side it continues "Napoleon Bonaparte passed his way in 1812 with 9,000 men." But within 20 years of that setback the winds of freedom were again attempting to sweep back the tides of oppression. In that year of 1831 Lithuanians lent active aid to Poland in a revolution against the heavy hand of Russian reaction and only the brute force of 150,000 Russian troops was capable of quelling their spirited struggle. Thereafter oppression was increased and intensified: Lithuanian lands were confiscated and then delivered into the hands of Russian nobles, the University of Vilnius closed, and finally Russians were everywhere designated to control the government, the army and the church.

When revolution erupted for a third time in 1863–64, the czar finally realized that military might had failed to conquer Lithuania's resistance. Suppressions, hangings, exiles to Siberia, czarist brutality failed to quell the indomitable love of freedom and self-determination of the gallant Lithuanian peoples.

World War I and the Russian revolution furnished the long-sought opportunity for which generations had been striving with such courage and fortitude. With the proclamation of Independence at Vilnius on February 16, 1918, and the treaty of peace of July 12, 1920, which accorded full recognition as an independent state, Lithuania reemerged to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

During her short-lived independence the country grew, prospered, and left an indelible influence for good upon the onrushing course of world events. Her domestic economy and foreign trade expanded mightily. Long-needed social services were instituted, her cultural life thrived under peaceful surroundings. Education once again became a reality for her people and agriculture, her principal industry, greatly benefited.

But Lithuanian freedom was tragically short lived. For in June of 1940 the armies of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany flagrantly violated the canons of international law and the rights of man and brutally subjected the Lithuanian people to a tyranny as coldblooded and remorseless as any act of aggression committed in this century of total war. The tragic events that followed are too well known ever to be forgotten.

The soul of a proud and great nation lives on beneath the brutal yoke of Soviet tyranny. It lives in the hearts of Lithuanian countrymen who cling to the motherland in the face of Communist enslavement. It lives in our own country where the brave liberty-loving peoples of Lithuanian ancestry have contributed so much to our own national experience and have given so tirelessly of themselves to the communities in which they live. It lives on in the richness and variety of the oldest living European language. It continues to live through the darkness of Soviet oppression keeping a prayerful vigil at the ramparts of national destiny sustaining the light of liberty which must never be extinguished and which will once again burn brightly to herald the arrival of a new dawn of freedom for Lithuania. Only then, will the oppressive "tides of tyranny" be turned back forever.

The Great Bay State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, both on the National and the State level we hear repeatedly that the proper amount of promotion in the field of tourism can be a tremendous boost to our economy. We in the Federal Government are extremely happy at the emphasis this administration is placing in the U.S. Travel Service's drive to bring visitors to this country. For a long time there was a tendency at all levels of government to treat tourism as sort of a stepchild.

I was happy recently, along with other Members of Congress, to visit the "Travel America" Auto Show at the District of Columbia Armory and to see there the exhibits of a number of States promoting the attractions of their particular areas. I was especially proud to see the outstanding exhibit of my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This exhibit arranged by the Massachusetts Department of Commerce, and staffed by a talented group, including a very lovely young lady, Miss Gayle Pope, who is "Miss Massachusetts." I commend the members of the Bay State delegation and both the House and the Senate for the cooperation they gave to the Commonwealth in connection with this show. I was also happy to note that the Governor of Massachusetts, Endicott Peabody, took time from a busy schedule in Washington to appear at the show.

More promotions of this nature will mean more visitors for the various States with the end result that the entire economy will benefit. As a son of Massachusetts, I want to state I was very proud of all the participants in this exhibit.

Annual Observance of Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Ledger, an outstanding weekly newspaper circulated in my district, has extended me the privilege of publishing a message to the community on the observance of Brotherhood Week, which was begun yesterday.

I welcomed this opportunity to express my thoughts on this observance and the special meaning it has for all of us:

Brotherhood Week is a fitting occasion to make a searching examination of how all of us are living up to the American way of life and its ideals. This great Nation has taken its strength from the ability of our citizens to live and work together in the interests of all people, regardless of religious or political faiths.

This special week is dedicated to the purpose of bringing together Christians and Jews in a bond of brotherhood and good fellowship. It also reminds us that prejudice and hate can destroy us and everything we hold dear.

The liberty of freemen and their right to worship God as they see fit is threatened today by godless communism. All of us who believe are called to show by our example of brotherly love that the ugly philosophy of communism is doomed. We must unite in brotherhood. So strong can such brotherhood become that we can defeat the evils of communism, and preserve our religion and our belief in the dignity of man.

Although the actual observance of Brotherhood Week lasts only 7 days, its real meaning should be practiced every day of the year.

FRANK HORTON,
Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, in this same issue of the Jewish Ledger, Donald Wolin, the editor and publisher, has written a very timely editorial. Employing the "coloring book" satire which is so popular today, Mr. Wolin has described in very fundamental terms the divisive influences at

work in our society, the unfortunate influences Brotherhood Week seeks to defeat.

I take pleasure in offering this editorial for publication so that my colleagues may also have the privilege of reading this appropriate message:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK COLORING BOOK

This week we are offering you free our nondisposable Brotherhood Week coloring book, complete with a crayon kit containing a generous assortment of colors—white, dark, black, brown, tan, yellow, and other various hues.

Spread out your crayons and turn to page 1.

Sunday: Notice the mother and father and their two children. They are dressed neat and clean. They are going to church. They appreciate the privilege of worshiping in the church of their choice. Color them appreciative. Use any crayon for their hands and face.

Monday: Father is at work. He works in a large office and wears a tie and white shirt. He has a very responsible and important job. There are many other workers in the office. How many different colors can you use in this picture?

Tuesday: Note that this page is divided into two sections. The first panel shows a crowded, dingy classroom in a shabby neighborhood. The second panel is a light, airy classroom in a different neighborhood. The first school is old and dilapidated, while the second is modern and expensive. It should not be difficult to color the students.

Wednesday: Father is home reading the evening newspaper. He is angry, bitter and frustrated. He is reading about ignorant racial outbursts from liberal arts students, Rockwell's Nazis, subtle discrimination in the North. The newspaper is not pleasant to read. Color it everyday. Make father any color. Make him continuously angry, bitter and frustrated.

Thursday: You must use your imagination for this page. Draw a Negro, Jew, Catholic, rabbi, priest, and cleaning woman. Ask your friends to do the same without revealing your drawing. Do you find striking similarities? Are you really surprised? You can have a lot of laughs with this page. You can also learn something about yourself. And your friends.

Friday: This family is Jewish. They are going to Friday evening services at their temple or synagogue. This page looks familiar because it is the same one we used on Sunday. Do you find it strange; they do not look strange? Color them similar.

Saturday: This is our puzzle page. Mother, father, and children are dressed to go dining. Color them dark. They want to eat in a nice restaurant where they will be genuinely welcome by the owner or headwaiter. They can't seem to find the restaurant. Can you? Do not waste too much time on this page. Color it hopeless.

Notice there are more pages in your book. One for each day of the year. It is impossible to erase or destroy those you tarnish. Be careful how you use your crayons.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 16, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

THE LINCOLN PHILOSOPHY

This week, as we observe the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, perhaps it is a good time to rededicate ourselves to the philosophy he gave us, the belief in our freedoms and in the private enterprise system. It is well that we remember his words that "as free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide." Unless we reverse the trend dictated by the policies and programs discussed in this newsletter, we may well be close to national suicide. Only by a return to the philosophy of constitutional-limited government can we return to the kind of nation envisioned by Lincoln when he said: "We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business."

UNITED NATIONS AID TO CUBA

The United Nations is going to give $1.2 million of your money to help strengthen communism in Cuba. And the only concern the Kennedy administration has, according to the press, is that this action "may add fuel to the attacks by some Congressmen on its Cuban policies." They are so right. This Congressman, for one, is going to continue to attack policies which are not in the self-interest of the United States and which, in fact, strengthen the sworn enemies of the United States. The latest move by the United Nations to approve a Cuban crop diversification project which will strengthen the agricultural economy of Cuba and make the Communist dictatorship more secure, it is a continuance of a policy which has seen the United States contributing to its own suicide by financing the United Nations so it could in turn finance Communist countries; and by our foolhardy foreign aid contributions to Yugoslavia, Poland and other Communist-dominated nations. The action of the United Nations Special Fund in approving the financing of the agricultural project in Cuba should call for this immediate reaction by the United States: (1) An immediate stop to all payments to the United Nations; (2) our withdrawal from the United Nations; (3) eliminate all foreign aid to Yugoslavia, Poland, and other Communist-dominated or neutral countries supporting our enemies.

THE FEDERAL BUILDING

The record will show that I have done everything reasonably, humanly, and ethically possible to get approval for the Dallas Federal Building. I have never, to my knowledge, made a statement that the Federal Building is not needed. My position has always been and still is that approval for the project should be based on merit—the yardsticks being (1) efficiency, (2) convenience, (3) economy. All Federal agencies and congressional committees which have investigated the project to date have recommended the building. I have now asked for an updated report from both General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office so that we may have at hand the latest figures on actual savings contemplated and a report on how Federal money already invested in site and planning is being protected. As a responsible representative it is my duty to continually check on how the peoples' money is being spent. It is up to the administration and the General Services Administration to either reject the Federal Building as not measuring up to the above-stated yardsticks, or to include it in the budget as first priority of any public works anywhere in the country. I would hope that all of us who have the best interest of Dallas at heart could get together to promote our community and not seize upon every occasion to discredit the efforts of those with whom we disagree politically. It is beyond understanding how the best interest of Dallas is promoted by the continued efforts to use the Federal Building as a weapon to undermine the Congressman from the Fifth District. I say, let's be done with the nitpicking and get on with the business of dealing with the life and death issues facing this Nation, including Dallas.

ADMINISTRATION TAX PROPOSALS PENALIZE THRIFTY

President Kennedy's proposal for a 5-percent floor on itemized tax deductions penalizes the thrifty and conscientious citizen-taxpaper. Under existing law, a taxpayer has the election either (a) to use the standard deduction or (b) to itemize his deductions. The administration's proposal would limit the itemized deductions (after first applying the limitation on medical deductions and a proposed limitation on the casualty loss deduction) to the amount by which the sum of the allowable itemized deductions exceeded 5 percent of the taxpayers' adjusted gross income. The 5-percent floor will reduce the amount deductible on the average by between 20 and 30 percent. In other words, between 20 and 30 percent of the taxpayer's State and local taxes, interest, charitable contributions, medical expense (after a 4-percent floor), casualty losses (after a 4-percent floor), and the other itemized expenses, will not be treated as a deduction from taxable income. This means that a taxpayer using the standard deduction will get proportionately a greater reduction in his tax liability than a taxpayer itemizing these deductions. In the middle income group, this disparity is as follows:

Percentage tax reduction when program fully effective

Annual income	Standard deduction taxpayer	Average itemized deduction taxpayer
	Percent	*Percent*
$5,000	33.3	18.7
$10,000	22.2	15.3
$15,000	20.6	13.9
$20,000	20.4	13.6

The taxpayer with the itemized deductions—the homeowner who pays local taxes and contributes to charity—gets less tax reduction. For example, a married taxpayer having an income of $10,000 from wages and salaries with two dependents, using the standard deduction, would get a tax reduction of almost $304. The same taxpayer, who had itemized deductions of $1,800 would get a tax reduction of only $182.

HOW MANY ARE PENALIZED

It is estimated that 51 million taxable returns will be filed under existing law. Of this 51 million, approximately one-half will use the standard deduction and one-half will itemize their deductions. There are both types of taxpayers in all income groups. In the middle income group, however, between $5,000 and $20,000, about 11½ million taxpayers will use the standard deduction and about 18½ million will itemize deductions. The effect of the 5-percent floor is to give greater relief to the 11½ million at the expense of the 18½ million.

WHO TAKES THE RISK?

The administration will attempt to overcome the argument that there is inequity by showing that all taxpayers will pay less taxes as a result of the package than they would under existing law. Many taxpayers may not object to the disparity within the same income group so long as they are getting a tax reduction. This is a shortsighted view. The administration admittedly proposes tax

reduction as a "calculated risk." In other words, it is a gamble. If tax reduction does not produce the miracle of growth that is attributed to it, tax rates will have to be increased. The taxpayer who uses the standard deduction has gambled nothing. He got the benefit of a temporary reduction. However, the taxpayer who itemizes his deductions gambles that tax reduction will result in a balanced budget. He will have given up between one-third and one-fourth of his deductions through the operation of the 5-percent floor. Therefore, if the package fails to produce a miracle, he will be worse off when taxes are increased again. That is why I will continue to fight for effective, equitable tax reform and a corresponding cut in Federal spending to establish fiscal responsibility rather than to depend upon miracles.

Radio and TV reports: Inside Washington—WFAA–TV 1:15 Sunday, regular weekly reports on radio stations KLIF, KSKY, KVIL, and KPCN.

Expianation of Public Law 87–297

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

This statement is issued because various articles and editorial comments in the January 20, 1963, edition of the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe about the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and about U.S. arms control and disarmament objectives are inaccurate and would, if left uncorrected, mislead the American people.

In today's world, a strong military establishment is essential. It does not follow, however, that our security can be maintained indefinitely by continuing the present arms race. Our defense budget is so large and the weapons of war are so devastating that safeguarded alternatives to the arms race should be explored.

Congress created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to seek alternatives which would be fully consistent with the security of the United States. Congress gave the Agency three principal tasks:

1. To carry out an extensive program of research in the field of arms control and disarmament;

2. To make recommendations on the basis of this research program to the President and to the heads of the agencies concerned with our national security; and

3. To provide direction and support for U.S. representatives engaged in arms control and disarmament negotiations after decisions establishing our Government's policy have been made by the President in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense and State, the Chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, among others.

Every major arms control proposal which the United States makes during negotiations is considered by all these men in order to assure that it is in the national interest. Any agreement obligating the United States to disarm would have to be approved by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate or a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress as required by section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

The United States, under both Democratic and Republican leadership, has attempted since the end of World War II to secure adequately safeguarded arms control and disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. There is nothing in the history of these efforts to indicate that a disarmament accord will come quickly while communism maintains its present goals. There is a possibility, however, that something can be done now to curb the arms race and to reduce the threat of war. Toward these ends, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is exploring such measures as a nuclear test ban agreement and possible measures to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication. At the same time, the Agency is studying broader areas in the hope that Soviet interests in disarmament may, in the future, coincide more closely with ours and be consistent with the security of the United States and the rest of the free world.

Detailed replies to specific statements contained in several articles in the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe are set forth below after the title of the articles:

A. BAN POSSIBLE IN 10 YEARS

1. While the time limitations for the completion of stages I and II of our outline of a proposed disarmament plan are set at 3 years each, there is no time limit set for the completion of stage III. The United States deliberately left open the time for the completion of stage III to assure that the process could be completed only if circumstances guaranteed our continued national security. Moreover, the United States alone would make the determination that it could safely proceed from stage I to stage II and from stage II to stage III if other parties were complying with the agreement and all conditions to protect our security had been met. Thus, while it is theoretically possible that general and complete disarmament might be achieved in 10 years from the ratification of a treaty, the statement in the articles that the United States could be disarmed in less than 10 years is totally unrealistic.

2. The suggestion that an arms control and disarmament treaty could come into effect without approval of the Congress is clearly erroneous. In section 33 of the act, Congress specifically provided that "no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

3. Section 47(b) of the act, authorizing the President to transfer to the Agency any activities or facilities which relate "primarily to arms control and disarmament," requires that such a transfer be made only after a report has been made to Congress and a period of 60 days has elapsed while Congress is in session. Thus, the statutory provision does not give the President carte blanche to transfer funds to the Agency. The purpose of this section of the act was to facilitate the efficient administration of U.S. arms control and disarmament activities. Such a provision is quite common in legislation that vests existing responsibilities in a new independent agency.

B. LEGION PROBERS FIND JOKERS

This article begins on the fallacious premise that the United States might accommodate the Soviet Union by disarming "completely before the U.S.S.R. had a single reduction in unit strength * * *." Department of State publication No. 7277 is cited as authority for the statement.

Publication No. 7277, entitled, "Freedom From War"; the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world is an outline of a plan which proposes balanced and verified arms reductions by all nations in steps and under conditions designed to assure the preservation of our freedom and security. It does not provide for unilateral disarmament. As the arms control and disarmament policy of the United States is developed and elaborated in increasing detail by this Agency, the provisions of section 33 of the act have been, and will continue to be, adhered to in every respect. The Director of the Agency recommends to the President and his principal advisers all significant arms control and disarmament policies. These recommendations are considered by all appropriately interested agencies, as well as the President himself, to determine if they are in our national interest. In the event our country agrees with foreign governments on a proposed treaty that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, the executive branch will then seek the approval of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate or of a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress. The American people are thus assured that any arms control and disarmament agreement which might be entered into by the United States will be, in the considered opinion of the country's highest officials, to the national interest. I am certain that if such a proposed treaty was not in the national interest it would be overwhelmingly disapproved by the entire Congress if submitted as a proposed statute or by the Senate if submitted under the constitutional treaty-making powers of that body.

The analysis of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provided by the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe article is largely inaccurate. Many of the sections of the act are drawn from other statutes which have been in force for years, and they do not provide the Director of the Agency with any greater powers than those given other agency heads. Following is a discussion of the sections of the act which were criticized by the article:

Section 35: The power to "assure cooperation" given to the President by the act does not give him the authority to rule by fiat over private individuals. It simply provides authority to "assure cooperation" between the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and other affected Government agencies. Such a statutory provision is common when there is potential conflict between agencies having overlapping interests. Somewhat similar provisions may be found in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. § 2037(b)) and the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. § 2471(e)). The President's power under the act to resolve differences of opinion between the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and other agencies is, in effect, nothing more than a statutory restatement of the President's existing authority under the Constitution as the head of the executive branch.

Section 41: This subsection authorizes the Director to "enter into agreements with other Government agencies" to secure the services of officers or employees for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This does not, as the article suggests, authorize the Director to "preempt" these agencies. The provision was incorporated into the act in recognition of the fact that these other agencies—particularly the Department of Defense—have personnel who would be of value to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in fulfilling its functions. Although the President would presumably have the power to "assure cooperation" in this area under the provisions of section 35, no such problem has arisen, nor is it anticipated. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has so far maintained a close and harmonious relationship with the Department of Defense

and all other agencies and departments concerned with national security. The President's authority to resolve differences of opinion that might arise under this subsection is only what is necessary and appropriate for the head of the executive branch to conduct an effective and efficient administration.

The article raises the further question whether the Director could, under the provisions of section 31(k), utilize the Army to "maintain peace and security" of the American people if they objected to continued disarmament. Section 31(k) contains no such authority; it deals with research that may be undertaken to assure that peace and security among nations is preserved during disarmament.

Section 41(h): The "rulemaking" power of the Director is circumscribed by the restriction that it must be exercised within the authority conferred by the provisions of the act. This authority is found in most legislation establishing governmental agencies. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is, like any other agency, accountable to the Congress if it transcends its rulemaking authority.

Section 41(g): The power of the Director to delegate the authority which he has under the act is identical to that given the directors of many Government agencies. It is given in recognition of the fact that the Director is unable to perform personally all the functions required of him under the act. The Director, of course, delegates this authority to those officers who are qualified to carry out the particular function. It might also be noted that all the officers and other employees of the Agency are subject to stringent security investigation requirements.

Section 43: This provision, allowing the President to exempt the Agency from the provisions of law relating to contracts or expenditures, requires that a prior determination be made by the President that "such action is essential in the interest of U.S. arms control and disarmament and security policy." A similar provision is found in the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2202). The Russians began a series of nuclear tests in the atmosphere on September 1, 1961. Our Government had been negotiating on a nuclear test ban in good faith and had not appropriated funds to immediately begin nuclear testing underground or to begin preparation for testing in the atmosphere. The President rightfully exercised his authority under 42 U.S.C. 2202 of the Atomic Energy Act to protect our national security by authorizing funds to be used to immediately begin nuclear testing. Moreover, legislative history of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act makes it clear that this power is only to be used in "exceptional cases." Such a determination would, of course, be subject to the scrutiny of Congress which could subsequently pass legislation modifying the President's determination. Even if the President should exempt the Agency from a particular provision of law, which he has not done so far, its spending would still be limited to appropriations made by Congress.

Section 45: Subsection (a) of this section provides in part that security requirements for Agency personnel "not be less stringent" than those of the Government agency or agencies having the "highest security restrictions." The security clearance awarded Agency personnel are given only after a most intensive investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Civil Service Commission. The provisions of section 45(b) are merely to assure that Agency personnel be cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission before receiving classified atomic energy data needed in the performance of their duties. This section contains an additional safeguard which requires that the Atomic Energy Commission make an independent finding that the Agency's security procedures and standards are adequate before such information may be received.

Section 46: The general rule set forth in this section is that contractors must retain their pertinent books, documents, papers, and records for 3 years after the final payment has been made by the Government to them under a particular contract. This provision is typical of those found in other acts. The sentence in the act which the article refers to is merely a standard exception of the general rule. This sentence only allows the early destruction of records if both the Director of the Agency and the General Accounting Office concur. It is worth noting, in this respect, that the General Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress and is independent of the executive departments.

Section 49: The Congress did not appropriate any hidden funds for the benefit of the Agency; indeed, it has not yet appropriated the full $10 million which is the maximum authorized under section 49. The appropriation actually made to establish the Agency and carry it through fiscal year 1962 was, with funds transferred from an earlier appropriation, a little over $2 million. This fiscal year Congress appropriated $6.5 million. Subsection (b) allows the allocation or transfer of funds actually appropriated by Congress for the Agency to another agency; not the reverse as suggested in the article.

C. CONTROL SYSTEM IS THEME OF RESEARCH

This article does not refer to research carried on by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It does, however, deal with the important problem of inspection of arms control and disarmament agreements. It is Government policy that workable and adequate inspection and control systems are fundamental to the disarmament process, and U.S. negotiators have insisted upon adequate inspection and verification as an integral part of any disarmament plan. The Congress is in the fullest accord with this point of view.

This insistence upon inspection is dictated by an unwillingness to trust this country's security to Communist promises of compliance. To insure that any inspection is adequate, the Agency is, therefore, exploring a great variety of techniques which will be both effective and acceptable. The study by the Institute for International Order referred to in this article, which the Agency did not sponsor or pay for, is only one of a substantial number of studies which have been undertaken. If and when the United States undertakes an inspection, the Agency will draw upon a fund of knowledge gained through study and research to establish a system which is adequate, acceptable, practicable and protects our national security.

D. PROGRAM COVERS ALL ARMS—EVEN YOURS

The U.S. proposals for the elimination of armaments are confined to those armaments used by "national forces" and do not extend to weapons used for sporting and other legitimate purposes. It is my opinion as well as the opinion of every attorney with whom I have discussed Public Law 87-297, that neither this act nor the proposals which the United States has presented in any way transgress the second amendment provisions of the Constitution that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Further, no strained interpretation of the act which violated this amendment would be countenanced by the U.S. courts. If you know of any attorney who interprets this act as described by the article in the Amarillo paper, it would be appreciated if you would send me his name and address.

The article's concern for the proliferation of crime in a disarmed world is misplaced. Even in the event that stage III of the U.S. Treaty Outline for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World were reached, individual nations would remain responsible for combating crime and other internal security matters. In fact, the United States was practically completely disarmed after World War I as our total manpower in our armed services in 1932 was only 132,069 men. It is my firm belief that had an Arms Control Agency been active following World War I, we would not have allowed our armed services to become so weak at that critical period.

I hope the above explanation will be of use to those individuals who are concerned with the security and protection of our Nation as well as clear the air of the inaccurate and misleading comments that have been attached to Public Law 87-297.

Founding of the 13th Colony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House very properly Tuesday called attention to the birthday anniversary of that great American, President Abraham Lincoln.

But I am afraid that another very important date in the history of these United States was overlooked. That was the founding of the 13th Colony, 230 years ago.

On February 12, 1733, Gen. James Edward Oglethorpe and a group of the most carefully screened settlers to form any New World colony, climbed the bluff at Savannah and established the colony that was to become the State of Georgia. The original territory extended from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River, and thus included the area now occupied by Georgia's daughter States, Alabama and Mississippi.

Georgia is the largest State east of the Mississippi River. She was the fourth State to ratify the Constitution, the third to do so unanimously. She was the starting point for the first steamship to cross an ocean, the SS *Savannah*, and the home today of the world's first nuclear-powered ship, the NS *Savannah*.

Spanish expansion in America was ended forever by Georgians at the Battle of Bloody Marsh in 1742.

Georgia was founded for philanthropic as well as military purposes, and honest, able-bodied men, languishing in English prisons for inability to pay debts, were her first settlers. The first orphans home, Bethesda, was located in Georgia, and the first Protestant Sunday school in America was organized in Savannah.

In Georgia is the largest undrained swamp in the United States, Okefenokee Swamp, and the largest exposed body of granite in North America, Stone Mountain.

Georgia pioneered the peach industry by using refrigeration in shipping peaches. Georgia is the largest naval stores producer in the world, and produces more watermelons than any other State in the Union. Georgia also excels in producing peanuts, pecans, and

tobacco, and produces more poultry than any State. Georgia has a greater variety of soil products than any other State.

Georgia manufactures paper, aircraft, automobiles, garments, food products, furniture, and other items, and ships them all over the Nation and the world. She has dependable labor, vast hydroelectric power and deep-channel seaports.

The cotton gin was invented in Georgia by Eli Whitney. The first railroad in America was built on a plantation near Savannah. Ether was first used as an anesthetic in Georgia, by Dr. Crawford W. Long. The first ice-manufacturing machine began operation in Georgia in 1844. The Girl Scouts of America was founded in Georgia by Juliette Gordon Low.

As a measure of her progressive nature, Georgia was the first State to require birth registration and the first State to declare that married women have full property rights. Georgia was the first and so far the only State to extend the privilege of voting to 18-year-olds.

The first chartered college in the world for women, Wesleyan College, is in Georgia. The University of Georgia is the first State-chartered university. Also in the field of education, Georgia leads in vocational rehabilitation.

To this Capitol in 1922 came the first woman U.S. Senator, Mrs. Rebecca Felton, of Georgia.

Georgia is a great State. I would like to ask unanimous consent that my remarks be placed in the RECORD in homage to the State I am proud to call home, and the First District of Georgia where, I am proud to say, it all started 230 years ago, in a wilderness peopled by strange Indians, at the top of a bluff on the Savannah River.

Lincoln in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of this House have just returned from their home States where they participated in programs and celebrations of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. I have been in my own home State, Indiana, which was the home of Abraham Lincoln for some 14 years.

This year Lincoln's birthday had a special significance for Indiana, for on that day was published an excellent book on the life of Lincoln in Indiana. This book, "Lincoln's Boyhood—A Chronicle of His Indiana Years," is by Capt. Francis M. Van Natter, a native of the area he wrote and studied about for many years.

I would like to invite the attention of the House to this new study which should appeal to anyone interested in Abraham Lincoln or in the qualities of character which have gone into the building of this Nation by its leaders. Captain Van Natter unfortunately died before his book came off the press; he had spent more than a quarter of a century in research and travel, covering every mile of Lincoln's Indiana years and exploring the sources of information in libraries, private collections, historical archives, local, State, and Federal sources and other places which might have information bearing on the Indiana chronicle. This book was published by Public Affairs Press, 419 New Jersey Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Captain Van Natter was a devoted Lincoln scholar as well as a patriotic and dedicated American. He was a hero in World War I where he won the Silver Star with oak leaf cluster for bravery in action. He was seriously wounded at the second battle of Marne and suffered wounds which were to disable him permanently. He also served on the staff of Gen. John J. Pershing and was chief of the diplomatic courier service in the Balkans during the postwar days of the peace conference.

Captain Van Natter made exhaustive studies of Lincoln. He devoted much time to public service activities, including veterans' organizations, and in Washington to the Indiana State Society and as a member of the Washington Civic Symphony. I mention these facts about the author to give a setting to the devotion of the author who was not only a loyal constituent but a close friend as well.

The book "Lincoln's Boyhood" has been received with warm praise by those who are best equipped to judge its merit—Indiana newspaper editors. While I will not take time to quote extensively, I would like to mention two timely comments.

Lincoln saw his first printing press in the office of the old Western Sun newspaper at Vincennes, Ind. Last week the Vincennes Sun-Commercial praised the Van Natter book, saying:

> It is an intriguing book. It pictures in detail the Indiana of those early days as Lincoln knew it. It emphasizes the miracle of Lincoln who from a lowly birth and a boyhood in primitive land of forest and rivers climbed to immortality, revered as no other American save George Washington.

In another part of the State the Huntington Press-Herald said editorially:

> The years of painstaking research bear fruit in the publication of Captain Van Natter's book * * *. The freshness of the interest-gripping narrative is undoubtedly in the sureness of the author's mastery of his facts. Every chapter reveals he did not go to library shelves to cull the writings of others for the fabric of his book, but bit by bit himself hunted out elusive details wherever they led him. The reader is aware from first page to last that the author has shared his own experience with the Lincoln story in Indiana.
>
> There will be among his readers those who rejoice that in this book there is no concession to present-day supersophistication. Captain Van Natter has written of a youth who trod the wilderness paths of Indiana on his way to becoming a national hero. To the captain, Lincoln is a hero and the years in Indiana helped make him so. There is nothing of apology in his book that he so believes and so writes. It is good in these times to read a book like this.

Many fine comments have been received about the book and I commend this chronicle to anyone interested in Lincoln. Before concluding I would like to invite the attention of the Members to the closing chapter of the book, "Lasting Impressions." This sums up the impact of the Indiana years on the future President and sets forth in a fine way the reasons why we in Indiana feel that we can lay a strong claim to helping build the character of one of our greatest Presidents.

I should like to add that this work has an extraordinary list of sources and a fine bibliography for those interested in further study of Lincoln and the Indiana years.

The Indiana Deepwater Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a handful of voices from without Indiana cry loud and long against Indiana's proposal to build a deepwater port on Lake Michigan. These voices criticize what is almost a unanimous feeling on the part of Hoosiers that a port should be built at Burns Ditch on Lake Michigan.

The people and interests who criticize do so with a selfish spirit. They have become so emotionally involved that they are now distorting facts and stooping to innuendo and inference in their fight to undo what Indiana has accomplished over a long period of years and what Indiana is determined to accomplish in the years to come.

The latest incident is the circulation of an article written by the editorial staff of the Louisville Courier Journal and published February 13, 1963. This article is being circulated on Capitol Hill with the inference that it speaks the gospel truth. Reference is made to the statement that two steel firms would never make a payment of any kind for use of the 300-acre, $30 million harbor. This is absolutely not true.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to paragraph 10 of the agreement between the Indiana Port Commission and Bethlehem Steel Co. which reads as follows:

> Bethlehem-owned vessels and other vessels en route to and from Bethlehem's pier and/or the slip referred to in paragraph 9 shall be permitted access to and across the waters of the outer harbor under the same terms and conditions extended to all other vessels and under the same regulations governing all other vessels making use of the Burns Waterway Harbor.

Paragraph 8 of the agreement between the Indiana Board of Public Harbors and Terminals, which is now the Indiana Port Commission, and Midwest Steel Corp., reads as follows:

> Midwest shall have the exclusive right in perpetuity to moor or tie up vessels for the purpose of loading or unloading along the full length of the western side slip or channel described in (7) above, and along the full length of the bulkhead or wave absorber referred to in (3), (4), and (5) above, subject

only to the payment of a charge for each vessel entering or leaving the port or harbor, which charge shall be reasonable, nondiscriminatory in character, and comparable to charges made for other vessels using the port or harbor.

This same article asks what these same companies will do for Indiana? It fails to point out that, among other things, these companies will build plants and facilities which will represent an investment far in excess of $1 billion. By the terms of the agreements referred to above, Bethlehem Steel is obligated to perform certain work on the port itself which is estimated to cost $2 million and Midwest Steel is obligated to likewise perform certain work which is estimated to cost $3.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, we, the people of Indiana, are shocked, we are insulted, we are downright angry because of these outside attempts not just to influence our destiny, but to direct and rule our destiny. I am especially concerned over attempts to mislead my colleagues on this issue of the Indiana port by "foreigners" who either lack factual information or who are deliberately distorting the facts.

U.S. Department of Labor: The Workers' Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of Labor is observing its 50th anniversary this year. I think this is a fact worthy of sustained note. The Department has carried on fruitful work in helping to improve the social and economic condition of wage earners in our industrial society. Much more work needs to be done in the forefront of which I am certain the Labor Department, based on its first 50 years, will be stationed.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert an anniversary article by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz which appears in the February 1963 issue of the AFL–CIO Federationist:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR: THE WORKER'S AGENCY
(By W. Willard Wirtz)

"The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."—Act of Congress signed by President Taft on March 4, 1913.

The 50 years of history since March 4, 1913, have been the most turbulent in man's history, filled with revolution, war, and economic depression, but also with great triumph and achievement. The Department of Labor has had an increasingly important role in our national response to these tides of change. Perhaps the central fact of our anniversary celebration is that despite the impact of two World Wars and profound scientific changes, the basic commitment of our society—and the Department's statutory share of that commitment—remains toward the individual.

Because the Department's concern is people, and its mandate is spelled in terms of human welfare, its history has a deep significance for our time. Originally an orphan agency of Government grown to cabinet rank only after adventures as a subordinate bureau wandering through the organizational charts of other agencies, the Department has remained relatively small—yet today it has assumed a central responsibility for a major decision we face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?

This is not unlike the questions that through the years have helped shape and form the Department. In its formative period, the overriding issues were immigration, child labor, and producing some accurate system by which to measure the changes in jobs and wages and hours and conditions of work. It was from the first the condition of the individual workingman and his family that gave the Department its meaning. It was an agency that sought to realize the dream of America held by the immigrants with whom it dealt; its purpose has varied little in the years since.

Yet its constitution has changed several times, almost in exact proportion to the changes in American life. During World War I, the concerns were primarily with manning the war effort and insuring needed production. In the peace that followed, the Secretaries of Labor considered the evolving technology of mass production and mass manpower needs and sought ways and means by which the security of individual workers could be vouchsafed. With the depression came a proliferation of departmental activities—the national employment service, wages and hours law enforcement, apprenticeship and training, the development of appropriate labor standards. With these changes, some of the older agencies were removed—Immigration and Naturalization, the Children's Bureau, the Mediation and Conciliation Service; none are today a part of the Department. New ones took their place—Employment Security, Labor Standards, Apprenticeship and Training, Wage and Hour, and the like.

The history of the Department is a record of response to change. For this anniversary year, a publication based upon reports of the Secretaries of Labor to the Congress since 1913 will be issued. Reading these texts, one is struck by the similarity of the problems and issues faced by each generation in turn. And one becomes more than ever convinced that tomorrow belongs to those who face the fact of change, who go forward to meet it, who see it as an essential quality of growth.

The problems that were very large in the past may seem small to us now and those we deal with today may lose much of their dimension in the eventful years ahead. The contribution of this agency of Government will continue to grow, however, so long as its tradition of confronting change continues.

That change today is measured in megatons of technological, demographic, political, social, and economic explosion.

As framers of the manpower policies of this Nation, we are challenged to keep pace with the genius of science. Technology is an inexorable force. Every new device is going to be used. What it is not made to alter for the better, it will alter for the worse and it will not wait. It offers the promise of man's fulfillment. We must bring to the architecture of manpower policy the degrees of invention, the ingenuity, the boldness which characterize today's phenomenal rate of scientific discovery.

Our task is harder than that of the scientist. When he discovers new truth, when the designer completes a new device, his job is done. There is the further responsibility upon us that we must develop those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole. Our task includes the responsibility to persuade, to obtain consent, to overcome the force of inertia which is represented in men's desire as individuals for even the incomplete security they think the status quo gives them.

Nor is it enough to be willing to adjust to change, for that would inevitably mean falling further and further behind until the forces of scientific and technological change which promise man's deliverance become rather the forces of his destruction.

Today, a man's job is also the uncertain product of unpredictable but almost certain change.

Within the next 30 days, 500,000 people will move to new employers, 600,000 to a different line of work, 400,000 to different areas of the country.

This change will be devastating unless we harness it to our own use. If we would make a firm course for change, we must first erect an economy capable of enlarging itself, an economy that offers to each man a meaningful use of his time and talent.

I subscribe to the old-fashioned belief that the best stimulant in the world to an economy is people coming in the doors of stores with money in their pockets. I think that in terms of our particular interest in achieving a full-employment economy, the largest importance attaches to the stimulation of consumer purchasing power.

We can and must do better in approaching the problems of technology. Attention must be given in the private processes of collective bargaining to the problems presented by automation. We are going to have to review our seniority, our job right systems, our employment security programs, our retirement plans to find ways of assuring that a man's rights are not destroyed when he has to move aside for a machine.

Only part of this job can be done privately. The rest of the answer to it is illustrated by the enactment by Congress last summer of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Under this legislation we will undertake to train some 400,000 people in the next 3 years.

We are going to need in this decade alone 5 million more skilled workers than we have presently available. These are job opportunities. We must inventory them. Retraining is being devised on a basis of working back from those and I am sure we can gear the retraining program to previously identifiable job opportunities.

The real answer to the change that is upon us is that nothing will make sense unless we expand the economy to the point where there are another 4 million jobs. There is only one answer to unemployment and that is more jobs.

We have vast unmet needs in this country. Our real wealth in meeting them is the use of the full potential of every single individual who wants to work. When we accomplish this, then we will meet these problems. Retraining is important in doing that and so are many other factors, but we must move the economy on to a faster employment pace.

The vantage of a 50th anniversary is the best one from which to consider this central challenge of continuing change. We do not face a world war, as we have done twice in the past. We do not face the collapse of an entire economic system, as we once did. We face, rather, the product of success—an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions, deprived itself of that many consumers and come to an impasse of demand. As in the earlier periods, the Department will be able to make a contribution to this problem because its central concern remains the person.

Another Round in the Russian Oil Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I would like to include a letter received from Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and my letter which is in reply thereto:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: It was with a great deal of interest that I heard of, and later read, your comments at the Mines and Mining Subcommittee meeting, Friday, February 8, 1963, in which you stated "So some of the Russian oil is going down to Venezuela and coming up here."

In view of the statement by Mr. O'Leary, representing the Department of the Interior, that the Department has no knowledge of transshipments out of Venezuela of oil from European and other areas, I would appreciate it if you could furnish me with the details of the information that you have. This is a matter in which we are all interested and I believe it essential for the committee to pursue this aspect of the residual fuel oil imports program and its impact on the domestic coal industry.

In addition to an amplification of your statement concerning Venezuela, I would also like to have details of other information you might have relative to the impact of Russian exports of residual oil, as referred to in your further statement that "one of the things that has come to my attention is that many of the other outlets which the South American countries have for their residual oil in Western Europe, of course, is being taken up by Russian oil."

I will appreciate receiving your reply at an early date so that we may decide whether to hold further committee hearings on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

FEBRUARY 18, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Thank you for your letter of February 13, which I have just received. Later, I expect to present to the House another detailed account of the impact of Russian oil exports on the economy and security of the free world, but meanwhile I hasten to thank you for your suggestion that the committee pursue the matter of Red oil's entry into U.S. markets and its impact on the domestic coal industry.

I consider it incumbent upon Congress to undertake a full disclosure of the international oil trade complex which permits the sworn enemy of this Nation to encroach upon our fuel markets and those of our allies. I have been impressed with miscellaneous studies made from time to time by executive department offices and congressional committees (such as the Bureau of Mines' 1961 "The Soviet 7-Year Plan for Oil"; the Library of Congress' 1961 "Soviet Oil in the Cold War"; prepared for a subcommittee of the Senate Committee of the Judiciary; the same committee's own hearings on "Soviet Oil in East-West Trade"; and the voluminous "Impact of Oil Exports from the Soviet bloc" by the National Petroleum Council).

Yet none has considered Soviet oil's threat to the U.S. coal industry, none has painted up the fact that transshipments of Russian oil have entered our fuel markets, and none has prompted action necessary to meet the challenge.

Even if Red oil exports were not reaching the shores of this country, I believe that their encroachment on markets of the free world would justify your proposed pursuit of the matter. Until current oil trade figures are available, the following information should suffice to activate such an inquiry:

In 1961 imports of crude oil into Brazil from the U.S.S.R. amounted to more than 8 percent of the total admitted from neighboring Venezuela. During that same year Brazil exported more than 1¾ million barrels of oil to the United States. Brazil also exported more than 6 million barrels to the Netherlands Antilles, which in turn ships heavy volumes to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this committee should also look into Italy's oil import and export situation. While I am hopeful that that country's trade philosophy will be revised following the recent death of Enrico Mattei, boss of the Italian State Oil Agency, still it could be the responsibility of this committee to make the determination of our petroleum trade with Italy and all other shippers. In the face of opposition by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Mattei negotiated with Russia for the presentation of great quantities of Soviet oil in exchange for steel tubing to be used for completing the Kremlin's network of oil pipelines.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of last August 20 reported that Mattei admitted that almost 40 percent of Italy's fuel comes from the Soviet bloc. Additional quantities of Russian oil are presumed to reach Italy through transshipment from Egypt, according to a Senate Judiciary Committee study published last June. Keeping these facts in mind, Mr. Chairman, will you please refer to these data from the Bureau of Mines' International Petroleum Trade for June 1962?

In 1961 Italy exported more than half a million barrels of gasoline and more than half a million barrels of residual oil direct to the United States.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the transshipments of oil between Russia and the United States present a problem that must be resolved as soon as possible. For this reason, I urgently request you to pursue this matter promptly.

Included in my statement which I shall prepare for House delivery will be your requested references to my remarks that "one of the things that has come to my attention is that many of the other outlets which the South American countries have for their residual oil in Western Europe, of course, are being taken up by Russian oil."

Mr. Chairman, I am sending this reply to you by special messenger in hopes that you will be able to decide quickly and in the affirmative on the advisability of further hearings. Since President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela will be in this city this week, perhaps it would be possible to persuade him to visit with the committee on the theory that a discussion will prove beneficial to our Nation and his as well. President Betancourt might very well be able to provide information that would enable the United States to place impenetrable barriers against the admission of Red oil without disturbing hemispheric relationships. It would be enlightening if he would volunteer to answer such questions as:

1. What was the full impact of the meetings between Venezulan Minister of Mines and Hydrocarbons and Russian diplomats in Moscow in September 1961?

At that time, Venezuelan Senator Luis Tovar stated that his country had approached the Soviet Union regarding the dumping of Soviet oil in traditionally Venezuelan markets; hence the negotiations in Moscow. If those discussions had any bearing on the transshipment of Russian oil into the United States, this committee should be so apprised.

2. What volume of exports into the United States must Venezuela achieve to satiate her aspirations in this direction, and to what extent does the Russian oil offensive affect the preferred level?

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning last week, it is especially important that this level be established. The report quoted a statement by the Under Secretary of State, who opined that doubts about the oil import control program "have caused and continue to cause problems in our relationship with friendly nations."

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind you that doubts about the residual oil import control program have caused and will continue to cause problems—including poverty and deprivation—among coal miners, railroad workers, and employees of allied industries. Under the circumstances, it would appear mutually beneficial if President Betancourt would express his views on this subject before our committee.

I thank you for your interest in my views, and I trust that you will decide to hold further hearings on this subject in the immediate future—this week if possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

Great New Dream for Europe Cause of British Freezeout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, while disagreeing with some of the opinions expressed by Mr. McGeachy in his Financial Post story of February 9 and agreeing with others, I believe he has given all of us some food for thought. The Financial Post story follows at the end of my remarks.

We cannot push out of mind the seriousness of the De Gaulle position, the Canadian governmental crisis, the U.N. decision to give economic aid to Cuba, the continuing floundering in the matter of world trade, America's chronic unemployment, the flight of gold, and the tightening of the noose around American exports and American investments in foreign countries.

Most of the present-day commentators seem to follow a given line as soon as they can distinguish what the line is to be.

All seem afraid of being the Devil's advocate or to appear to be swimming against the current.

One wonders if they are afraid of their own ability to analyze the current events in relationship to the past and the effect upon the future or whether they feel that they are safe "so long as they have the majority to point to as being with them."

Insofar as the Common Market is concerned, not even an 8-year-old would have believed the foolish and unsound propaganda put out for the benefit of the U.S. Congress prior to the passage of the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Personally, while favoring responsible trade and fair trade in the trade picture, I never could understand how this Nation swallowed this trade propaganda hook, line, and sinker.

I pointed out time and again that the Common Market had never really accepted the full text of our trade bill and at no time did this group accept our insistence upon keeping the favored-nation clause.

The Common Market group, in spite of the stories showing a unanimous vote against De Gaulle, still will not buy our trade bill unless we discriminate by quota arrangements and other restrictive covenants against other nations in competition with the Common Market, for our American marketplace. In spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, the only lucrative market for consumer goods in the world today is still the United States.

All of our push for the Common Market acceptance of Great Britain is based upon a political consideration, to consider it from the economic base would bring us to exactly the conclusion reached by De Gaulle, "it won't pay."

This is not meant to absolve France from any blame if the market collapses which would be a major catastrophe in our scheme of things, but to point out that De Gaulle has every reason to object to British entry for purely commercial reasons.

If the British joined the Common Market and still maintain their preference status with the Commonwealth, it will give Britain the benefits of the open market of the Common Market while its own marketplace will be preempted by the preference status of the Commonwealth nations.

Further, if Britain follows our urgings and follows our favored-nation policy with underdeveloped nations as well as Japan, Hong Kong, and other consumer goods producers, the Common Market again finds itself in a bind with their market protected for United States and British goods but the United States and British market open to all comers.

For the past 3 years, as a Member of Congress and heading the committee studying the impact of imports on employment, I have pointed to these simple facts and to the serious unbalance of world employment when trade is based upon selling price with no regard to cost of production and individual country economies.

It must be remembered when dealing in trade that first, last, and always, the making, producing and growing of goods for selling is a commercial venture with profit as its first goal and all other considerations such as diplomacy, defense, philosophy and theory as secondary and all too often used as blinds for the plain unvarnished search for greater profits.

No person will argue with those amongst us who sincerely or selfishly promote world peace and brotherhood, but let us get one point clearly imprinted upon our rather confused minds—trade will not promote, nor can it guarantee, peace or good will unless trade is equitable, fair, and profitable.

Profits alone cannot do other than destroy good will and friendship. No better illustration than De Gaulle's position on Great Britain. In spite of the universal clamor for De Gaulle's scalp, the real truth of the matter is that the first consideration in his decision is the plain and simple commercialism of trade, jobs, currency exchanges, and the power that stems from an expanding economy.

This is not the time to check out item by item the competitive problems that would ensue for France if Great Britain and the United States were admitted carte blanche to the Common Market without joining the club all the way.

"Joining the club" means cutting out our favored-nation clause, commonwealth preferences, selling in the world market with subsidies, tax credits, preferred rates, and currency manipulation.

Someday it may happen, but as for the foreseeable future it is my studied opinion that only two things can happen. We keep out of an all-out agreement with the Common Market as prescribed in the present trade expansion bill or we end up with the most serious domestic economic letdown in our history, plus a worldwide trade debacle that will shake many heads of government from their positions of control.

Our problems can best be understood if we learn a little more about our friends and allies, neighbors and ideologies.

You can call your government any name you wish, a democracy, a monarchy, fascism, communism, or any other catch name and you will end up in the ashcan of yesterday's promises unless you keep your own peoples' welfare first in your deliberations, treaties, and agreements.

This does not mean that you have to take advantage of other nations and their peoples, but rather that in protecting your own economy, you are in fact protecting their welfare.

It is no bargain for the Chinese in Hong Kong to work for a net of 47 cents a day, 10 hours under sweatshop conditions, to make products for the use of Americans, French, Germans or anyone else whose incomes are from 10 to 50 times as much per day for the same work.

We can excuse our policy by saying that we are helping these people who otherwise would have nothing. By the same argument, we can excuse taking the land from our Indians, putting the Africans into slavery since we gave them clothes and shelter which was an improvement over nakedness and ignorance.

Sometimes one wonders how anybody can, in good conscience, promote trade as a builder of good will amongst peoples when we buy the products simply because a foreign worker works for less money and we can use foreign trade both as a wedge to sell—give away—our products not produced overseas while at the same time we can pressure both industry and labor in the consumer goods fields.

This Nation is being pushed into a trade pocket by the importer-exporter groups plus the international investor the same as the New England and Mid-Atlantic States were pushed into a production-labor pocket about 30 years ago when the low costs of the South acted as a magnet for our textile, hosiery and garment industries.

It is accepted by all who study the economics of trade that production will flow to the low-cost areas and distribution will flow to the high-income areas.

That is why the children of Hong Kong and Japan cannot afford the toys and togs of their own industry. The markets in Europe and the United States are more profitable. This is true in every item produced in competition between high-cost and low-cost economies.

Perhaps our world planners fail to realize that the market plan is sustained only by production wages.

When Japanese goods produced for 35 cents an hour replace American-made goods at $2.85 an hour in the American marketplace, they take from the marketplace $2.50 of purchase money which means that soon the market money in the United States dries up and both the Japanese and the U.S. worker find themselves walking the streets unemployed.

When we ship $11 worth of products to Japan, we export 2 hours worth of U.S. labor—labor roughly 50 percent of cost of production—but when the Japanese ship $11 worth of goods to the United States the same amount of goods would require seven times as much labor in the United States, since Japanese labor only gets one-seventh of our U.S. wage but because of the U.S. production methods, they produce as much per man-hour as we do.

In fact, by my own observation, I can vouch for an even greater production per worker in the electronics industry.

Now if we flood our market with these products at lower prices, we buy more products but we cut out more American jobs, the end result has to be unemployment, depressed areas, and overproduction worldwide.

Lately I received a letter from Ed Wimmer of the Independent Retailers of the United States. He tells of visiting a store selling typewriters and found over a hundred foreign makes, but only two American made—the full truth is that some parts of the American makes came from overseas also.

Personally I went shopping for a portable sewing machine with Mrs. Dent. We could not find an American-made machine in three stores; finally located a Singer store with all foreign-made machines except one made in the United States. The U.S. machine was the most expensive by 200 to 300 percent. The others were made in Canada and Great Britain.

In dollars maybe we can compare favorably, but in man-hours of labor we come out a miserable last.

Until a trade program based upon a compensating factor equalizing costs of production is put into worldwide trade agreements, we will have the De Gaulles, the Castros, and all the rest of the disturbing elements that have kept our world in an uproar since the first man had a surplus and tried to sell it.

I cannot agree with the common belief that those of us who promote protectionism for American jobs are narrow and isolationists. The truth of the matter is that we are doing more to insure economic stability both nationally and internationally than those among us who under the guise of good will and free trade are exploiting the workers in every foreign country for exorbitant profits and some governmental greed.

When we buy cheap in a foreign country we are not always assured of keeping the same product cheap in the United States. The last 2 years ought to convince any observer that trade is commercial and most of those who are in the forefront of the free trade and trade expansion are greedy, selfish, mistaken, or misinformed.

For instance, prior to the so-called rebirth of the free trade movement, under the pressure and urgency of the agents of the registered agents of foreign countries such as the firm of George Ball and his associates, Tom Dewey's group, and hundreds of others who are registered as foreign agents representing manufacturers, exporters, importers and foreign governments, we had some privileges as individuals while traveling abroad. For instance we could bring back to the United States up until 1960, $500 worth of foreign purchases. This was reduced to $100 by Executive order. We could send back gift packages within a limit of $10; this has been reduced to $1.

Who benefits by these orders? Certainly not the foreign merchant since he would earn a more reasonable profit by retail sales than by sales to exporters. Not the U.S. tourist because he would get a more reasonable price at the foreign source rather than being forced to buy from an American importer who can bring in unlimited amounts. Certainly our Government will not benefit since we are shifting the individual purchase to the bulk purchaser who may pay a little customs, but the volume he brings certainly takes as much gold out of the country in the end. Certainly the American worker or producer does not benefit since the individual purchaser would buy much less in volume for the same amount as an importer and in all probability would buy goods not normally produced in the United States as a sustaining consumer product.

The $1 limit of gift packages can be described as an embargo on individual purchases for the benefit of the profiteering importer and nothing else. The whole trade program is oriented for the benefit of the profiteers when considered from the economic angle.

If we say we are worried about our balance of payments—and we should be—then I would recommend three simple but effective deterrents to the disappearing gold pile:

First. Apply a compensating factor at customhouse, removing all other restrictions, quotas, currency manipulating and customs by adding a compensating tax to equalize costs of competitive goods at customhouse with platform costs United States. This must be a two-way street. We cannot expect the right to bar foreign products with quotas and then subsidize our exports to cut prices in foreign markets and vice versa.

Second. All American travelers change U.S. currency into foreign currency before leaving the United States or upon arrival in the foreign country in all nations where we have counterpart funds and/or where any nation limits its nationals' spending while traveling to the United States.

Third. Enforce restrictions on foreign investments by barring products from these investments being returned to the United States in competition with domestic products—sewing machines and typewriters, and so forth. An investment to help a foreign economy is one thing but an investment made to displace American goods on American shelves is another.

The following feature story on De Gaulle shows how most of us are influenced in our thinking on trade by having angles and issues entering into the picture that treats the trade consideration as a minor consideration.

Behind all the talk of France's grand design let us not hide our own grand design—which has been fostered and developed under the guise of free trade and sold to the American people as well as foreign workers as a sincere effort in behalf of a better place for all of us to live. There are, of course, many persons who honestly believe in the grand design. However, the facts of life are to the contrary.

True real trade opportunities based upon equity will make a better place for all of us but trade as we know it today is selfish, greedy and above all—benefits those who most practice exploitation of workers.

De Gaulle may be all wrong, but insofar as we Americans are concerned, it will give us a new lease on our industrial life. Any delay in putting the new trade laws into effect will help the American economy and for this, at least, De Gaulle deserves a few kind words.

When De Gaulle and others inside the market who agree with him are pushed off the scene by the international profiteers and exploiters, many an American worker will lose his job.

Summing up for the moment before introducing the McGeachy article, let me say without reservation that nothing takes the place of a job to a man who must work for a livelihood.

The dignity of a job cannot be compensated for by relief, handouts, doles, or doubletalk. Next to life itself, the honest man wants to provide a living for himself and his family.

The story that follows may give you an insight into the international picture and show why, as some are saying, "De Gaulle must go":

[From the Financial Post, Feb. 9, 1963]

GREAT NEW DREAM FOR EUROPE CAUSE OF BRITISH FREEZEOUT

(By J. B. McGeachy)

A free vote by the six members of the European Common Market (ECM), if a free vote had been taken, would evidently have gone 5 to 1 in favor of admitting Britain.

De Gaulle's veto worked like the single blackball cast against election of a man to a club. Whether it makes sense to run great alliances on club rules is open to question. There's a possibility that De Gaulle's one-man decision will be reversed.

Meanwhile, ECM as it stands is quite an achievement. To describe it contemptuously as "little Europe" is exactly as silly as it would be to call the United States "little America."

The present ECM and the United States have about the same population. Steel production in 1961: ECM, 80 million tons; United States, 98 million tons. Foreign trade in 1961: ECM, $64 billion; United States, $39 billion. With all the coal, iron, fast-flowing rivers, and other natural resources it needs (except oil), ECM is a very going concern.

If the British want to join, as evidently many of them do, there's no valid commercial reasons for keeping them out. But De Gaulle's main objection was not commercial. It was political and, above all, military.

To consider the political angle first, it's clear that De Gaulle thinks of the Franco-German alliance as the dominant element in ECM. Since France and Germany together have more than half of ECM's inhabitants and wealth, this is not a wholly unreasonable proposition.

The entry of Britain would clearly transform the ECM political scene. It would rule out domination by De Gaulle and Adenauer, or their successors.

Just for this reason the Italians, Dutch, and Belgians fervently want Britain in. They don't relish the prospect of all ECM decisions being imposed by the Paris-Bonn axis. Also they have a strong faith in Britain as the country, par excellence, able to show others how to run a democracy without going off the rails. There is some merit in that judgment.

Before De Gaulle, who has virtually abolished the French Assembly and possesses more authority than any Frenchman since Napoleon, French parliamentarism was a kind of Gallic farce. As for the Germans, the Hitler period (1933–45) showed how disastrously they could depart from the principle and practice of popular rule through ordinary, decent men.

The smaller powers in ECM don't want to see it gummed up or committed to dangerous courses by French reversion to the political nonsense of 1947–58 or German reversion to rule by a gang of adventurers.

They feel, not without cause, that Britain would be the sober, reliable, experienced partner who could keep the ship on an even keel. So they want Britain in.

But the great debate has a second political angle, about which points of view are far less clearly defined. De Gaulle keeps on referring to Europe as extending "from the Atlantic to the Urals," the mountain range that separates European from Asiatic Russia. What does this mean?

Does De Gaulle seriously envisage the expansion of ECM to include not only the Soviet satellites (East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the rest) but the more populous and richer half of the Soviet Union itself? (What happens to Asian Russia is not indicated.)

De Gaulle apparently does foresee this future for the European union. The vision, as some people think, is simply absurd if not mad; "demented" a London paper calls it.

Yet perhaps it is not more demented than the existing actuality, with Europe split by an Iron Curtain, the Moscow-Washington quarrel still unresolved, and the cold war seemingly destined to go on forever. Surely this state of affairs is about as mad as possible.

We have all got so inured to these political facts that we tend to regard them as eternal verities. De Gaulle, a tough realist in war and politics, does not see the future in this static way. He expects change.

In particular he thinks the world may some day be confronted by the spectacle of a Washington-Moscow axis. This arrangement (often advocated here) could be the best guarantee of peace on earth; but it would evidently demote ECM to junior status. For this reason De Gaulle is against it. He wants to get to Moscow before the Americans get there. (To think about world affairs in Gaullist terms, you have to rid your mind of can't and stand-patism, and let your imagination roam freely.)

Would Britain in ECM be an obstacle to De Gaulle's seemingly grandiose political designs? It's hard to say. But certainly Britain as an agent of the United States in ECM (the role De Gaulle thinks she would play) would be quite hostile to any scheme for getting the Russians into a European alliance. This could be another reason why De Gaulle wants to keep Britain out.

We come to the military side of the controversy, probably the most important. Walter Lippmann says the debate inside ECM, on Britain joining, was not about trade and tariffs at all; it was about American nuclear power.

To see this point one must bear in mind Britain's "special relationship" with the United States, in this case not sentimentally based on a common language but severely practical. From the United States, Britain has received special aid, in technical know-how and blueprints, in manufacturing its nuclear deterrent. The American McMahon Act was amended to make this possible but France wasn't named as a beneficiary.

The French have felt aggrieved about this ever since. "Why," asked a prominent Frenchman, "is it safe to let that secret information cross the Atlantic but unsafe to let it cross the Channel?" De Gaulle is huffy about Britain's privileged position. But he adds that France has never asked for U.S. nuclear data. He spurns U.S. aid in this form.

And De Gaulle accurately perceives that, at ECM discussions on strategy, Britain would be in an embarrassed or handicapped position. Possessing technical knowledge they could not divulge, could British delegates be candid or useful? Probably not.

Incidentally, one might speculate on whether Britain was kept out of ECM, because, as in honor bound, she refused to share with De Gaulle the nuclear information supplied confidentially by Washington. This is possible. Whether or not it's true may not be known until certain memoirs are published 20 or 40 years hence.

But quite apart from the question of American secrets, De Gaulle is out of tune with Britain on nuclear policy. He thinks that Britain, by tying herself to the American atomic chariot, has lost all independence.

There's evidence to support this opinion, notably the Skybolt incident publicized around the world after the Kennedy-Macmillan talks in Nassau.

When Kennedy told Macmillan that Britain would get Polaris (submarine) missiles from the United States instead of the promised Skybolts, the President probably thought this was just a routine technical decision, of a kind Washington is used to, that all concerned could accept without turning a hair. He had no inkling, or at least no real appreciation, of the size of the political row he would stir up in London.

Britain is committed to building its own nuclear bombs, both atomic and hydrogen, and has accumulated a modest number. After expensive but futile experiments in making missiles, Britain went out of the missile business for good and decided to rely on the United States for the vehicles to carry its bombs.

Macmillan's opposition, the Labor Party, has taken the line that the British nuclear effort is little better than a joke. Could Macmillan produce, the Socialists kept asking, a single Washington quotation to show that the Kennedy administration took this British contribution seriously?

Alas, poor Macmillan could not. Indeed the available Washington opinions (like Dean Acheson's recent article in Foreign Affairs) tend the other way and rather suggest that a hill of beans would be about as much use in a war as Britain's hand-me-down, poor relation's stockpile. But at least Macmillan could point to the U.S. promise of Skybolts. Wasn't that a proof, he could ask, that Washington thought well of Britain's performance?

Then suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, comes the bad news, a political haymaker, perhaps, for Macmillan: no Skybolts, Polaris missiles instead. To use them Britain must spend on submarines at least $1.3 billion she can ill afford. The change compels Macmillan, without prior consultation, to recast his whole defense system. Henry Kissinger, leading U.S. military writer, complains that this was no way to treat the principal ally of the United States, even if Polaris is a better missile than Skybolt. (And who knows if it is? Skybolt had a successful test the very day after the Nassau meeting.)

The theory is that Britain's Polaris-equipped subs will be part of a multinational force under NATO command (which De Gaulle flatly and no doubt truthfully calls "American command") but that Britain can withdraw them for independent use in case of emergency. But it can readily be shown, as British technical writers have shown, that there are numerous simple ways by which McNamara could inhibit any British action of this kind.

De Gaulle wants neither nuclear know-how nor missiles from the Americans. He was offered Polaris but turned it down. He will build his own missiles (as well as his own bombs). For if, he asks, he went to the enormous expense of building the necessary submarines, and if when they were ready the United States should announce that Polaris must be discarded as obsolete (quite possible), what then? What indeed?

But De Gaulle's questions go deeper. If Western Europe is militarily invaded by the Russians, even with conventional arms, the United States is pledged to attack Russia with nuclear bombs. Is this promise credible? Would the United States, just to defend Western Europe, risk Russian nuclear retaliation on New York, Chicago, Detroit, etc.?

I have searched the literature on this question, raised again by De Gaulle, and found only one answer that looks even plausible. This is the McNamara doctrine that, in the position described, the United States would A-bomb Russian military targets only. It would not attack Russian cities; therefore it would not invite reprisals on American cities.

This doesn't sound reassuring to me. For what about escalation? Once a nuclear war begins, even if limited in the first stage, is it not likely to develop into unlimited bombing and carnage? I'm inclined to believe with General de Gaulle, that the United States would shrink from putting its nuclear arsenal into action if only Western Europe were threatened. And it's impossible not to agree with De Gaulle that Nassau would give the United States the exclusive power to say when and where nuclear weapons should be used.

De Gaulle wants some say for France. He admits that his stock of A-bombs is puny beside the great power accumulations. But France has now the power, through A-bombs carried in bombers, to kill 20 million Russians in a few seconds.

De Gaulle doesn't expect a Soviet invasion of Europe; and he may be right. But, in case it should happen, he believes the capacity to destroy 20 million people (more deaths than Russia suffered in the whole of World War II) would have at least some effect on the aggressor's conduct.

He could be correct in this opinion; but who am I, who is any other civilian, to bandy words on the subject with one of the great military theoreticians of this age, as De Gaulle showed himself to be in his marvelously prescient pre-1939 books.

The purpose of this piece has been elucidation, especially of De Gaulle's point of view which many find baffling or even infuriating. I think he will turn out to be wrong: I think the Atlantic Community will come to pass. Meanwhile, in dealing with De Gaulle on this matter we are not dealing with a madman, fanatic, or French jingo; but with a soldier, strategist, and politician of genius. This should be borne in mind.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1963

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

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

O Thou Searcher of Hearts, may those here commissioned by this free Nation to find the balm of peace for this ailing world, as they seek for truth, not evade the truth about themselves.

We confess that with all our surveying of national and world problems, we too often dread to know our own hearts, with their strange deceptions. As for this moment we look away from our mundane tasks to Thee, Thou Judge of all men, strip us of our illusions; create in us clean hearts, O God; and renew a right spirit within us.

In this, our brief working day, if there is any kindness we can show, may we not neglect or defer it. If there is any word we can speak as we strike a blow for righteousness and freedom, unfetter our lips.

Use us, we pray, as Thy channels to turn this hour of tumult into triumph for all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 18, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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