the opportunity to obtain congressional expressions, the Munich was underway, pretied up with a new set of clothes supposed to represent modernization of our weapons systems. Even if Polaris is considered sufficient, extra insurance in Italy and Turkey won't hurt.

The Nassau agreement with Prime Minister Macmillan was another example of negotiation in sunny secrecy, of decisions which affect us all but which were arrived at quickly, perhaps precipitously by the Executive alone. Perhaps Congress should feel no pain at being left out of that one, however. The President's own Secretary of State, or at least the man who carries the title, wasn't even present. Maybe that was a simple division of labor. The President took on the job of imperiling Mr. Macmillan's government and the Secretary of State was held in reserve to do the same sort of job on Canada's Prime Minister.

When, if ever a disarmament agreement finally is reached, one wonders what razzle-dazzle of public relations will be used to break the news to the American people and their representatives in Congress. What are the guidelines for disarmament? I hope they are clearer, more solid, and more definitive than the shifting sands of the Executive's statements and press releases on the subject.

But where, instead, are the policymolding position papers on disarmament being written? Many of them are coming from the special, private research corporations which, through contracts with the executive branch, are springing up like mushrooms, or toadstools, in Washington today.

The excuse for these groups is simple. Government can't pay the salaries needed to get top rate men, it's said. So the private corporations are founded, with massive Government contracts, to provide the thinkers who wouldn't work for ordinary wages. These policy technicians have become virtually a counterpart government, responsible to no constituency but fully integrated into the Executive's excessive power structure.

This shadow government is just another way around Congress, another way toward an all-powerful Presidency no longer harnessed to Government institutions responsible for their decisions but free to use the whole Nation as the guinea pig for special theories and special interests.

Other Presidents have had their kitchen cabinets, even their shadow cabinets. This one is the first to have a shadow government.

Of course, there are excuses aplenty for this Executive excess. One is that our society has become so complex it can no longer rely on the cumbersome machinery of representative government to get its job done. There seems to be some magic mathematical limit on individual responsibility.

Planning is another magical excuse word. Our society is said to be so interdependent that it can't rely on individual responsibility to accomplish the integrated planning needed to get us moving.

I think those excuses are nonsense. The root of the growing tree of Executive power is simply distrust of the people.

The New Frontier is simply a frontier of fear—fear that people can no longer manage their own lives, fear that they might take some course other than that plotted and planned in the all-wise, all-knowing ivory tower.

Taxes are described in this new philosophy as not merely a means to raise revenues but as a way to distribute income. The free market doesn't do a good enough job. People spend their money on the wrong things. The solution? Simple, let the Government take the money and spend it for you.

It's really ironic. In this period of our history, since the turn of the century anyway, our average incomes have doubled and doubled again. Our individual education has grown from a grade school average to a high school average and is now approaching a full college average.

Nevertheless, we find that the prevailing theory is that we are not smart enough to handle our own affairs. We must be protected from ourselves.

We can't insure ourselves against sickness or old age. The Government must do it and do it all, without options, given its way.

We can't build our own schools in our own communities. The Federal Government must do it for us.

We can't settle our own affairs in business and industry, the Federal Government alone is wise enough.

We can't raise prices, we can't lower prices, we can't work short hours, we can't work long hours. We can't be trusted even to take someone to lunch for a business chat.

That's the nub of it. Mistrust of the people.

One of the administration's economic oracles spelled it out in a book when he wrote that "the marginal tax dollar has currently a much higher social utility than the marginal pay-envelope dollar. The former goes to schools; the latter into tail fins." The author was Alvin Hansen, professor emeritus of political economy at Harvard.

Simple, isn't it? Government is wise. Individuals are foolish.

Nobody denies that some people do act foolishly. Even people in government act foolishly. Even Senators do—although rarely.

But today we see public policy based upon the sweeping assumption that most people would behave foolishly if left to their own devices and not herded by government.

The picture is alarming. Parents would stop sending their children to school and then they'd stop building schools. Everybody over 50 would be ground down under the poverty induced by a misspent youth. Our cities would lie in rubble because the residents wouldn't have enough sense or money to keep them up. The countryside would be a tangle of weeds because there would be no one to tell the farmers what to grow. Detroit would be making cars 50 feet long, costing $50,000 which would be sold in great numbers to the 6 or 7 bloated millionaires who had made billions by merging railroads and forcing everyone to buy high cost steel. Why there might even be some extremists in our midst who would hold meetings to criticize the Soviet Union.

Far fetched? It may sound so, but it is precisely this sort of mistrust of the individual that lies behind every attempt to usurp the power of the people in order to protect the people.

I prefer, and I think most Americans either do or will, when given a clear choice, prefer the sort of government envisioned by the late Supreme Court Justice Jackson when he said, "It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizens from falling into error; it is the function of the citizens to keep the Government from falling into error."

Fortunately, we can still do this. The Congress may be unpopular in some quarters, but it is still there. And you still elect it. You, in particular, are involved, because you still cover those elections and can accord to them the importance they deserve.

This is not a partisan matter. My good friend, the late great Democratic Senator Robert Kerr was alert to it when he said that he honored the President but he honored the wishes of the people of Oklahoma more.

He was sensitive to it also when he obtained a virtually unprecedented unanimous vote from his colleagues to try to prevent the President from administering the public works funds as a tool of political pressure.

Our challenge today is to the structure of our government, its entire system of checks and balances, not just to one party or another. The Presidency is fast becoming a party unto itself, aloof, alone, lordly, and disdainful of the individual. Rule by machine has been a disgrace in some of our major cities. But rule by machine is becoming a crisis in our capital. The population explosion may be a peril elsewhere in the world but it is the power explosion in Washington that is the peril here.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the great goal of our liberty. We must not now, on pretexts of efficiency or new problems and new answers abandon that goal and substitute in its place government of the Executive, by the Executive and for the Executive—or, to put it bluntly, government of the Kennedys, by the Kennedys, and for the Kennedys.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Our Father, God, in whose eternal peace, which passeth understanding, our fretful, restless spirits are quieted. The fierce tempests sweeping across our sadly sundered world leave us weary with watching and guarding the ramparts of freedom. These testing times find out our every weakness.

In the midst of our bewilderment and perplexity, we turn to the infinite calm of Thy changeless love, that we may find inner sustenance, wells of living water restoring our souls, and bringing serenity under strain, as in Thy name we battle for the truth.

In these confused times, when so often the props of moral support seem bending with the weight of secular ambitions, make plain to our understanding that legislative enactments alone are futile, and that except they be undergirded with a sustaining strength, not our own, we labor in vain to bring order out of the chaos which threatens to engulf the selfish schemes of willful men who have not Thee in all their thoughts.

We ask it in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 22, 1963, was dispensed with.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the remainder of the week while the Senate is in session.

The subcommittee is conducting hearings on the Youth Employment Act of 1963, which is S. 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that, under the agreement reached last week, the time limitation begins at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The order is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, Feb. 25, at 12 o'clock noon, debate on the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] (S. Res. 91, 92, and 93) to S. Res. 90, to amend rule XXV, be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided between the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour until 5 minutes to 12, and that there be a 3-minute limitation on statements during that period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, covering the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 902, FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR FALSIFICATION OF RECORDS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Coal Research, dated February 15, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LEAD AND ZINC MINING STABILIZATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DELIVERY OF WATER TO LANDS IN THE THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ROBERT O. NELSON AND HAROLD E. JOHNSON

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VISA PETITIONS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions which that Service has approved, according to beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report from the Office of Emergency Planning on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 8

"Concurrent resolution relating to Devils Jump Dam

"Whereas a condition of intense economic distress and basic regional underdevelopment exists in an area of southeastern Kentucky and northeastern Tennessee; and

"Whereas an intensive total development program is underway in this area in which the efforts of local, State, and Federal interests are devoted more aggressively than ever before to every aspect of area development; and

"Whereas one real opportunity to create the necessary foundation for significant achievement within this overall program exists in the potential of the proposed Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas the Devils Jump project would accelerate and expand the success of the development program in this area more than any other factor, and, at the same time, the overall development activity would add to and multiply the benefits of this project far beyond those calculated in establishing the feasibility now recognized by the U.S. Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas the Devils Jump project, by itself, would create an unusual and outstanding mountain area reservoir in the existing national forest area of unexcelled natural and unspoiled scenic beauty, and this project represents a unique opportunity to establish a major conservation and recreation area; an outstanding fish and wildlife habitat; and a principal tourist mecca, all with great benefit to the economy to this area and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the U.S. Bureau of the Budget is requested to approve appropriation for the planning and developing of Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir.

"SEC. 2. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky petitions the Appropriations Committees in the U.S. Congress to include the Devils Jump Reservoir in appropriations of the 88th Congress.

"SEC. 3. That the U.S. Corps of Engineers is requested to expedite construction and development of Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir to assist in the economic development of southeastern Kentucky and northeastern Tennessee.

"SEC. 4. That the congressional delegation from the Commonwealth of Kentucky use their good offices to achieve the ends mentioned in section 1 to 3, preceding.

"SEC. 5. That the clerk of the Kentucky House of Representatives be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Kentucky Members of the U.S. Congress, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, and to the Chief of the U.S. Corps of Engineers."

Resolutions of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 15

"Resolution relating to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects

"Whereas the several States of the Union have taken the initiative in fishery research and development; and

"Whereas the off-shore fishery resources of the United States are the proper concern of both the Federal and State Governments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage and assist in State research and development programs; and

"Whereas a bold program to assist the States in their efforts to develop their fishery resources is essential to the proper conservation and utilization of this basic resource: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to S. 627 introduced by the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, U.S. Senator from Alaska, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 19, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"SENATE RESOLUTION 16

"Resolution relating to the food-for-peace program

"Whereas the Federal Government has embarked on a program of Food for Peace to facilitate the purchase of domestic food surpluses for sale to needy foreign nations; and

"Whereas the use of high-protein value fishery products would contribute to the value of the program; and

"Whereas the development of the offshore fishery resources of the United States can be protected only if expanding domestic and foreign markets are provided and developed; and

"Whereas the untapped offshore fishery resources of the United States are being harvested by foreign powers unconcerned with proper conservation measures: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to S. 702, introduced by the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON with Senators E. L. BARTLETT and THEODORE KENNEDY, a bill which would make a domestically produced fishery product available for distribution under the food-for-peace program to assist that program and the development of the domestic fishery resource; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 19, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO REDUCE FEDERAL TAXES WITH TAX REFORMS

"Whereas an early Federal tax reduction coupled with tax reforms will increase the strength and vigor of our economy; and

"Whereas the stimulus of this proposed Federal tax reduction with tax reforms would release investment capital, create jobs, increase consumer spending and raise profits; and

"Whereas it will release the economy from the shackles of an overly repressive income tax structure so that it can move ahead to full capacity utilization of its human and physical resources; and

"Whereas it would avoid the recurring recessions that have characterized the postwar years; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth as well as every other State will benefit from the new tax program through additional job opportunities and more money to spend: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to reduce Federal taxes with tax reforms as proposed by the President of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate February 11, 1963.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, regarding the lumber industry in the United States

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forest to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay high wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canadian, due to the latter's advantages, including: Depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping, a cooperative Government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the Representatives in the Congress from the State of South Dakota.

"NILS A. BOE,
"President of the Senate.
"MILLS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska, That the following article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Congress of the United States through the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 29, 87th Congress, 2d session, is ratified:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Alaska shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the Administrator of General Services and direct facsimile copies to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 1, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 11, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor February 18, 1963.

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1009

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States and the U.S. Senate, by the constitutional vote of two-thirds of each House concurring therein, did enact at the 2d session of the 87th Congress of the United States of America in 1962, a proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment was submitted to the States for ratification and said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America is in the following words, to wit:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll or other tax.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does hereby ratify the above proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Administrator of General Services of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE AUTOMATION OF OUTGOING MAIL FROM THE POST OFFICES IN THE CITIES AND TOWNS IN BRISTOL COUNTY

"Whereas on January 22, 1963, outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County will be processed at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and

"Whereas this new process will result in a job loss as well as a huge dollar loss to said cities and towns, with no guarantee of improved mail service: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the automation of outgoing mail in said cities and towns; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Postmaster General of the United States rescind the order providing for the processing of outgoing mail from said post offices in said cities and towns at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, February 12, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, favoring authorization for further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments:

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a total of 465 appointments and promotions of general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list;

Lt. Gen. John Knight Waters, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general;

Maj. Gen. Theodore John Conway, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson II, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Robert E. Cushman, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Brig. Gen. William Joseph Hixson, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Rear Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy;

Edwin S. Miller, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Navy;

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Rear Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

Rear Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of vice admiral;

Col. Donald J. Campbell, Air Force Reserve, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve;

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Francis Stevens Greenlief, Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 21,719 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Jimmie M. Anderson, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Thomas C. Fleury, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army;

Harold R. Aaron, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Robert A. Campbell, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Raymond L. Abbott, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Gene W. Oehlman, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Asher D. Abelon, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates, for appointment in the U.S. Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 902. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 903. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Dreyspring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 904. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of proposed national parkway extensions or connection to Blue Ridge Parkway, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Foothills Parkway, Mammoth Cave National Park, and Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Jasper Y. Willoughby; and

S. 906. A bill for the relief of Maria Carraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 907. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FONG (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 908. A bill to amend section 305(b) of title 37, United States Code, relating to foreign duty pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Mrija Lovsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 910. 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 Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 911. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 912. A bill approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 913. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 914. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. 915. A bill to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (by request):

S. 917. 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.

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

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON):

S. 918. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. MECHEM):

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

RESOLUTIONS

FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

DESIGNATION OF MAJORITY AND MINORITY MEMBERS ON STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 96) designating majority and minority members on standing committees of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 97) appointing members of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, which was considered and agreed to.

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

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK REGARDLESS OF SEX

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

This bill is the administration bill. It is similar to a measure which passed both Houses during the last Congress but which died because of the press of business at the end of the last session.

I believe that this bill is absolutely essential if we are to provide the kind of economic structure which I believe a democracy requires. The majority of employers in this country do pay equal wages for equal work.

But all too many employers—unfortunately aided at times by misguided employee representatives—have exploited their female employees by the payment of discriminatory wages.

This exploitation not only creates a severe hardship for the nondiscriminatory employer who must compete with the employer who pays unequal wages, but also contributes to poor morale among workers and substandard living conditions in a large number of families where the woman is the principal wage earner.

I am hopeful that both Houses of Congress will quickly ratify their action of last year by the speedy passage of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, along with the accompanying letter and statement of the Secretary of Labor, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 910) 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, introduced

by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 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,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards for employees necessary for their health and efficiency;

(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act, through exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to correct the conditions above referred to in such industries.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this Act—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

(b) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(c) "Goods" means goods (including ships and marine equipment), wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof, but does not include goods after their delivery into the actual physical possession of the ultimate consumer thereof other than a producer, manufacturer, or processor thereof.

(d) "Produced" means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this Act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof, in any State.

(e) "Employ" includes to suffer or permit to work.

(f) "Employer" means any person having twenty-five or more employees in any place of employment and includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, including any person having the authority to hire, dismiss, and control the work of such employee, but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State.

(g) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer.

(h) "Wage" paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary, to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such board, lodging, or other facilities for defined classes of employees and in defined areas, based on average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. Such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wages paid to any employee.

(i) "State" includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf Lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(j) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(k) "Labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

SEC. 4. (a) No employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall discriminate, in any place of employment in which his employees are so engaged, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to any employee of the opposite sex in such place of employment for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system which does not discriminate on the basis of sex: *Provided,* That an employer who, on the date of this enactment, is paying a wage rate differential which would be in violation of the Act on its effective date may adjust the lower wage rate as follows:

(1) On the effective date of this Act, all wage rate differentials shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the higher wage rate in effect on the date of enactment;

(2) One year from the effective date of this Act, remaining wage rate differentials shall be reduced by an amount equal to 15 per centum of the higher wage rate in effect on the date of enactment;

(3) Two years from the effective date of this Act, any remaining wage rate differential shall be removed.

(b) No employer shall discharge, cause to be discharged, discipline, or otherwise discriminate against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act. No labor organization, or its agents, representing employees of such an employer shall cause or attempt to cause such an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this Act.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of Labor—

(1) shall prescribe such regulations and rules as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this Act, including regulations to protect against violation of the wage standards of any other applicable law and to safeguard wage levels in the elimination of wage rate differentials under section 4(a) of this Act;

(2) may investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment in any industry subject to this Act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act;

(3) if a violation is found to exist, the Secretary may, before taking further action hereunder, by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion, endeavor to eliminate discriminatory practices prohibited by this Act and to secure restitution of wages which an employee would have received had the employee been paid at the rate paid the opposite sex as required by this Act and reinstatement to employment where an employee has been discharged in violation of this Act;

(4) may enter and serve upon any employer or labor organization found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing in conformity with sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, to be engaged in or to have engaged in any violation of section 4 or section 7 of this Act, an order requiring such employer or labor organization (A) to cease and desist from such violation, and requiring such employer (B) to pay to each employee who has been adversely affected a sum equal to the amount of the wages due such employee at the rate paid to an employee of the opposite sex, plus up to an additional amount as liquidated damages not to exceed the back wages found to be due; and

(5) may enter and serve upon any employer found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing as provided in paragraph (4) hereof, to have discharged or otherwise discriminated against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of section 4 or section 7 of this Act, an order requiring such employer to reinstate such employee, or to remove such discrimination, and to pay to such employee a sum equal to the amount of the wages of which such employee has been deprived by reason of such discharge or other discrimination plus up to an additional amount as liquidated damages not to exceed the back wages found to be due.

(b) For the purposes of any investigation or proceeding conducted under this Act, the provisions of section 307 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (16 U.S.C. 825f), shall be applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

(c) The Secretary shall have power to petition any United States district court, within the jurisdiction of which the violation of this Act occurred or such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of any order issued under this section and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall file in the court the record in the proceedings. Upon filing of such petition, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief and restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Secretary. No objection that has not been urged before the Secretary or hearing officer, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Secretary or hearing officer, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary or his hearing officer and to be made a part of the record. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and he shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to

questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive, and shall file his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original order. Upon the filing of the record with it, the jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals.

(d) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary issued under paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (a) of this section may obtain a review of such order in any United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the action in question was alleged to have been engaged in or such person resides or transacts business by filing in such court within sixty days of such order a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, certified by the Secretary. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Secretary under subsection (c) of this section, and shall have the same jurisdiction to grant to the Secretary such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Secretary; the findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall in like manner be conclusive.

(e) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Secretary, as provided in this section the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (47 Stat. 70; 29 U.S.C. 101–115).

SUPERVISION OF WAGE PAYMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise the payments of any amounts owing to any employee which have been withheld in violation of this Act. Any sum owed an employee and paid to the Secretary under this Act shall be held in a separate account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) No wage restitution shall be required with respect to any violation of this Act for any period which preceded by more than two years the date of commencement by the Secretary of Labor of the first administrative or judicial proceeding relating thereto.

(c) No person shall be subject to any liability for the commission of any action prohibited by this Act if he pleads and proves that the action complained of was in good faith and in conformity with and in reliance on any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 7. (a) Except as hereinafter provided in this subsection, in any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all of the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all of which are referred to hereinafter as agencies of the United States), for the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in any amount exceeding $10,000, there shall be included stipulations under which the contractor (1) is required to compensate all persons employed by him in the manufacture or furnishing of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in conformity with the requirements of this Act, and (2) shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act. The Secretary of Labor may, when he deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions of this subsection in any specific contract.

(b) No contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act or any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until or unless the contractor has satisfied the Secretary of Labor that he is complying with his obligation hereunder and that he has in good faith established and will carry out wage policies and practices to assure future compliance. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of persons ineligible for contract awards under this section. The Secretary of Labor shall cause the names of persons whom he determines to have made a satisfactory showing of present and future compliance with this Act to be removed from this list.

POSTING

SEC. 8. Every employer subject to this Act shall keep a copy of this Act posted in a conspicuous place in or about the premises where any employee is employed. Employers shall be furnished copies of this Act by the United States Department of Labor on request without charge.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1963.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting an administration proposal 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. I am also enclosing a summary statement explaining the need for the legislation and the purpose and effect of the bill.

The existing practice of some employers in paying discriminatory wage rates with respect to the same or comparable work has an undesirable effect on many aspects of the life of our Nation. The attached draft is intended to work toward the elimination of these effects in interstate commerce channels. Among other compelling reasons for its enactment is the necessity to utilize fully the skills of women in our labor force. The number of women workers is expected to increase to more than 30 million within the next 10 years.

The proposal is in the nature of new legislation and would not amend any existing law.

Yours sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN ENTERPRISES ENGAGED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

This proposal, which is on the legislative program of the Department of Labor, has as its purpose the elimination of discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer. Employers having employees engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce and Government supply contractors whose contracts exceed $10,000 would be subject to its coverage. "Employer" is defined to mean any person having 25 or more employees in any place of employment.

Those employers would be prohibited from paying a lower wage to one employee than they pay to an employee of the opposite sex in the same place of employment for work of equal character requiring equal skill. The bill would permit employers to adjust these lower wage rates over a period of time, not to exceed 2 years. Further, labor organizations would be prohibited from causing or attempting to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of the act.

Express provision is made for the Secretary of Labor, who is to administer and enforce the act, to eliminate discriminatory practices through conference and persuasion and to secure voluntary wage restitution. It is contemplated that educational and compliance programs will be emphasized to secure maximum employer and labor organization cooperation.

The Secretary would be vested with the authority to make rules and regulations necessary for the administration of the act. Regulations which might be necessary to protect against any application of the act in contravention of the wage standards of any other applicable law and to safeguard wage rate levels in eliminating differentials would be included in this authority.

When compliance is not forthcoming, the Secretary is authorized to hold administrative hearings with respect to alleged violations. He could issue cease and desist orders and orders for the restitution of wages withheld in violation of the act, plus up to an equal amount as liquidated damages. The Secretary is also authorized to issue orders requiring reinstatement of, and wage restitution to, any employee discharged for assisting in the enforcement of the act. If necessary, the Secretary could seek a court order requiring compliance with his orders.

In addition, an employer would be subject to the sanction of ineligibility for Government contracts after a final determination of violation of the act. This sanction would not be applied and would be immediately discontinued when the Secretary of Labor determined that the employer has come into compliance and would, in all likelihood, continue to comply in the future.

Equal-pay legislation is an essential step toward the administration's goals of economic growth and social justice. The need and justification for a Federal equal pay law, a matter of common knowledge, was well substantiated by the record of testimony in hearings on equal-pay legislation in the 87th Congress.

The burden of the present unfair practice of paying lower wage rates for the same or comparable work to workers of one sex falls most heavily on those least able to bear it, that is, women who do not belong to unions. The large proportion of working women sus-

ceptible to this discriminatory treatment is shown by the fact that only 3.5 million of the 24.5 million women presently employed are covered by collective bargaining agreements.

A significant number of employers freely acknowledge payment of wage rates on a double standard basis. When reporting job vacancies to employment offices, many employers in States without equal-pay legislation list vacancies with a single job title but with a higher hiring rate for men than for women. It cannot be expected that discriminatory pay practices will voluntarily be discontinued on any widespread basis in the foreseeable future because these practices are evident in new companies and in new industries.

The present practice of paying discriminatory wage rates on the basis of sex has an undesirable effect on many aspects of the life of our Nation. It tends to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the living standard of workers. It offers an unfair competitive advantage for employers who follow this practice. The resulting low wage levels often prevents the maximum utilization of worker skills to the detriment of morale and, in turn, of production.

The contributions employed women are currently making to our economy are vital to the production of essential goods and services. The demand for these goods and services will grow materially in the next decade when the national population is expected to increase by 28 million persons. Six million more women workers will be required by 1970 to meet growing consumer needs. This means that within 10 years there will be at least 30 million women in the labor force.

To facilitate the effective use of these workers and to encourage the highest development of their skills, widespread application of the equal-pay principle should be promoted by Congress. This principle is of vital importance in times of economic recession when the employment of women at a lower wage rate than men on comparable jobs may be used to undercut the wage rate of men or cause their displacement.

In addition, discriminatory wage practices are inconsistent with the fundamental American principle of justice. The knowledge of their existence reflects on the prestige of the United States in affairs around the world.

It is of great importance that Congress act without further delay to eliminate these practices from the channels of interstate commerce.

COMPENSATION TO THE CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS, MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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. 914) to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby authorized to be transferred in the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and expended pursuant to the exclusive decision of the Crow Tribal Council, for its use and benefit, and the benefit of its members, a sum of money as hereinafter provided. Said sum is intended to include both just compensation and other justifiable considerations for terminating and extinguishing all of the right, title, estate, and interest of said Indian tribe in and to the lands of that part of the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation to be determined by a survey to be made, as hereinafter provided.

(b) That the United States shall cause a survey to be made of the perimeter boundaries of the tract of land within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, which lies easterly of the lands which were allotted on the Crow Indian Reservation and the one hundred and seventh degree longitude west of Greenwich meridian.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall appraise the fair market value of said lands as surveyed, taken by this Act, and said fair market value shall be determined as the effective date of this Act, and shall also appraise the fair rental value of said lands from the year of 1891 to the effective date of this Act; that said appraisals shall be made within ninety days after the effective date of this Act, and offer that sum to the Crow Tribe. The Crow Tribe may also appraise the fair market value of the lands taken by this Act and shall also appraise the fair rental value of said lands from the year of 1891, to the effective date of this Act, and determine whether the appraisal of the Secretary of the Interior is acceptable to the Crow Tribe. If the offer of the Secretary of the Interior is not accepted by the Crow Tribe within sixty days after receiving notice of the appraisal of the Secretary of the Interior, the Crow Tribe is authorized to commence in a court of competent jurisdiction an action for determining the just compensation payable for such taking of said lands.

SEC. 2. All minerals, including oil and gas, on all unentered and vacant lands within the area described in section 1 hereof, are hereby reserved for the benefit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, which shall be leased or otherwise disposed of under the laws and regulations relating to Indian trust lands.

SEC. 3. All patents, trust patents, and conveyances, and other instruments of title, heretofore issued, executed, and made upon said lands by the United States, within the area described in section 1 hereof, are hereby validated, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 4. Neither the initial transfer of such funds to the tribe, as provided herein, nor any subsequent per capita distribution thereof, shall be subject to taxation.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

PROGRAMING OF LAND-USE PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas.

The bill would accomplish these objectives by requiring:

First. That locally initiated, comprehensive plans for long-range development of individual communities be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator for his approval as a condition to the grant of Federal financial assistance for public projects in such communities. This requirement would become effective 2 years, after the enactment of the new legislation.

Second. That after 4 years following enactment, locally initiated comprehensive plans of an areawide character be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator for his approval as a condition to the grant of Federal financial assistance for public projects in individual communities within metropolitan areas designated by the Administrator.

Expanding population and other pressures in the Nation's metropolitan areas often result in public projects which are poorly planned, uncoordinated and wasteful. Projects undertaken without adequate coordination and planning too often serve conflicting purposes or fail to meet future needs.

Where careful, coordinated planning precedes the undertaking of projects, costly mistakes can be avoided and the realization of desirable goals hastened.

The Federal Government assists the States and their localities through a variety of programs in the financing of many public projects. Accordingly, it has a proper interest in seeing that they are soundly conceived and effectively executed. It has a responsibility to ensure, in every possible and appropriate way, that the taxpayer's dollar is wisely spent. It is impossible to justify the expenditure of billions of dollars of Federal funds for highways and mass transportation, intercepting sewers, sewage treatment plants, housing and urban renewal projects, airports, purchase of open land, and a wide variety of other federally assisted works, in the absence of overall plans for the use of private, local, State, and Federal resources in meeting the growing problems of these urban areas.

I am not alone in this view. In 1962, a distinguished panel known as the Municipal Manpower Commission urged this same approach.

The commission, financed by the Ford Foundation at the urging of the American Municipal Association, the American Society of Planning Officials, and the American Institute of Planners, was first headed by James E. Webb, now Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, subsequently, by John J. Corson, distinguished management consultant. The commission included such other leaders from the ranks of business, government, and education as William O. Baker, scientist and vice president of research for the Bell Telephone Laboratories; Edward W. Barrett, dean of the Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University; William H. Draper, Jr., investment banker; Luther H. Gulick, director of the Institute of Public Administration; Ralph Lazarus, president of Federated Department Stores; Robert E. Merriam, author

and former White House assistant; Quigg Newton, president of the University of Colorado and former mayor of Denver, and John A. Perkins, president of the University of Delaware.

In its discussion of the relationships of the Federal Government to metropolitan areas, the commission said:

The impact of Federal activities on metropolitan areas requires better coordination of its programs. The Federal Government must establish some organizational machinery for this purpose. * * * It is patent that the Federal Government either must take immediate steps in this direction or must accept responsibility for accentuating the metropolitan problem even while it strives to resolve segments of the whole problem.

The Federal Government's partnership role should also involve increased incentive for effective State and local action on metropolitan problems. Several actions point the way: (1) Federal grants are available now for metropolitan planning, and (2) local governments must have a program of community improvement (workable program) and must be making progress toward carrying out that program in order to receive grants for urban renewal and community facilities. Similarly, any area receiving aid for mass transportation must have a program for the development of a comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation system. In the new open space program, grants are dependent upon the existence of an areawide plan.

After the commission's report, Congress passed an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act requiring the Secretary of Commerce to withhold Federal highway funds in the absence of continuing comprehensive planning for coordination of highway and mass transportation in urban areas of more than 50,000 population.

The commission's report continued:

The Federal Government can give substantial impetus to local efforts by applying such requirements to other programs of Federal assistance, and by specifying high procedural standards for the conduct of these activities at the local level. In particular, Federal assistance should be conditioned on plans covering the whole metropolitan area, rather than only single units of government. The purpose of Federal grants should be to help communities to do the things they want to do, but to do them better and on an adequate scale. The basic initiative must remain with the local community leaders—both civic and governmental.

In 1954, at former President Eisenhower's urging, Congress made the so-called workable program part of the housing law of the land.

Today, the workable program means that a community which wants Federal dollars for individual urban renewal projects, for mortgage insurance commitments in redevelopment areas and for public housing to relocate families, must show that it has an overall plan for community improvement. Once the plan is approved by the Housing Administrator, Federal funds may be made available on a project-at-a-time basis, consistent with the plan.

Essentially, my bill proposes an extension of this concept. I believe the requirements it imposes for planning in the housing field should be expanded to include other programs where local communities rely on the Federal Government for assistance. And I believe the new requirement should properly emphasize planning on an areawide basis.

As urban life grows more complex, the pressures of population surges compound the efforts of the central city to grapple with the difficult problems left in their wake. But these problems of urban overcrowding, of slums and downtown decay, of depressed business and industrial sections are not the problems of the city core alone. For the problems of growth extend across city lines into suburbia. The older suburbs face the same fate as the downtown cities. The rapid changes caused by the mobility of our population obliterate the old boundaries, and new problems of urban growth are leapfrogging into once rural areas.

The workable program idea was first recommended to President Eisenhower in late 1953 by the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs, which included such housing experts as Albert M. Cole, former Administrator of HHFA; Norman P. Mason, his successor at HHFA under Eisenhower; Aksel Nielsen, Denver banker; James W. Rouse, former president of the Mortgage Bankers Association; Richard J. Gray, former head of the Building Trades, AFL, and Alexander Summer of Teaneck, N.J., builder.

On the workable program, excerpts from the report of the President's Committee said:

During the past three decades the number of Federal programs directly affecting the physical development of our urban communities has steadily increased. With two or three notable exceptions there has been little if any conscious effort on the part of Federal agencies administering these programs to cope with the local problems created by the cumulative effect of the Federal programs upon the communities, and very little concern as to whether the local developments undertaken with Federal financial assistance were in conformity with the general plan for the development of the community as a whole.

There are several Federal programs which vitally affect community development and which to insure most efficient use of Federal funds, if for no other reason, should include as one of the basic requirements the existence of an up-to-date general plan of the community and conformity of Federal or federally aided projects with the general plan.

The accumulative effect of these programs upon the community is such as to place upon the Federal Government the responsibility for actively promoting and encouraging adequate and sustained local planning to insure the coordination of the Federal or federally aided projects with each other and with local plans for future development, as well as to insure the existence and use of a plan and a continuing planning agency as a focal point for consultation and advice in each community with respect to plans for future development of the community.

And the President's Committee found that:

HHFA is in a position to do more for the orderly and economical development of the urban communities of the country than any Federal agency has done to date. * * * This new coordinated planning approach to the solution of urban problems by the Federal Government would give new and concrete meaning to the national housing policy. No longer would the Federal Government neglect its responsibility to encourage sound local planning and to recognize the integrity of sound local plans locally prepared, a responsibility which is implied but not specifically required by so many Federal aid statutes.

Testifying before the House Banking Committee in 1954 in a successful effort to convince Congress of the need for the workable program concept, then Administrator Cole of HHFA stressed the pragmatic approach to the planning problems of communities which seek Federal assistance.

Mr. Cole said:

This workable program requirement is intended to stimulate and encourage the community to undertake to develop better and more up-to-date codes and regulations and vigorous, effective enforcement of those codes in an effort to see that its housing is brought within at least minimum decent standards. It is intended to stimulate and encourage the community to undertake positive measures to bring about the conservation and rehabilitation of neighborhoods and areas that are economically sound and worth saving in order to prevent the creation of new slums, and to see that practical steps are taken to assure adequate rehousing and fair treatment for families who may be displaced by subsequent clearance or rehabilitation operations.

There should be no straitjacket applied by reason of the workable program requirement. From those cities more advanced in bettering their conditions we should expect more. From those cities just beginning this long road to removing slums and blight and to preventing it through realistic codes and aggressive enforcement, we should be understanding of the time and effort it takes to develop and put into effect a full-scale local attack. We should take full account of varying local situations and the different circumstances confronting the large and the smaller city. What we are seeking, I think, is a bona fide and practical expression of the community's own projected program to deal with its own problems, presented in good faith and with the firm resolve to carry that program through to accomplishment.

Since enactment of the workable program, the Housing Agency which administers it has followed this practical, step-at-a-time approach. I would like to see the same logic applied to the expanded workable program concept which I advocate for the coordination of all Federal aid programs, particularly as it applies to areawide planning.

The new requirements proposed by my bill, far from slowing the processing of applications from local, State, and regional to Federal agencies would, I believe, speed up the process. For communities and regional agencies would know in advance that coordination of their activities must lead to the kind of comprehensive planning which the Federal Government would require. Differences would be ironed out more promptly than they are today, with more effective utilization of all our resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my formal remarks there be included in the RECORD editorials from the Newark, N.J., Evening News and the Passaic, N.J., Herald News, as well as a recent newsletter I wrote on the subject for release January 30, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the last-mentioned

material the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 2, 1963]

GETTING TOGETHER

Senator CASE is proposing legislation to bring coordination and commonsense to Federal programs affecting urban and suburban areas. He wants to end especially the present competition for land by Government agencies. His bill would provide that no Federal funds would be made available for any project unless it is consistent with a "locally drawn, long-range workable program."

The "workable program" concept, already the controlling factor in Federal decisions on slum clearance and urban renewal, would be extended to airports, water systems, sewers, and sewage plants and other public works.

Although Mr. CASE doesn't mention highways, he implies he wants them brought into his coordination system. For he cites as an example of cross-purpose the original plans for constructing the Essex East-West Freeway as an elevated road. This type of construction, which is all the Federal Bureau of Public Roads would pay for, would have damaged redevelopment programs approved by the Federal Housing Administration.

As another example of lack of consultation, Mr. CASE points to the conflicting aims of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Army Corps of Engineers in plans affecting the Great Swamp in Morris County.

One further difficulty that Mr. CASE may want to cover in his bill arises from the fact that highway planning and other projects frequently affect more than one municipality and create serious disagreements among them. Coordination among Federal agencies is necessary, but there should be some machinery for achieving it at the local and regional level as well.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News, Feb. 4, 1963]

THIS IS OUR UNCLE SAM

Report of U.S. Senator CASE, of New Jersey, on lack of coordination between Federal Government agencies:

"Since September 1960, the Department of the Interior has been acquiring land for its new national wildlife refuge to preserve the great swamp area in its present unspoiled form. But in July 1961 the Federal Aviation Agency publicly testified to the suitability of the great swamp area over other sites for the location of a fourth major airport for the greater New York area. And the Army Corps of Engineers, which is putting the finishing touches on a major flood control plan for the Passaic River Valley, proposes the drainage of the great swamp area and its consequent use for industrial and residential purposes as a partial justification for their proposal to build the Little Falls-Nutley Tunnel to regulate overflow. Has there been consultation between these three separate Federal agencies? None is discernible. Frequently lost sight of, I fear, are the will and the desires of the communities and the larger areas which would be affected by federally assisted public works projects."

Senator CASE thinks something should be done about it and has proposed legislation which would require coordination between Federal agencies and "restore the initiative to the community, the county, the urban area and the State for the best utilization of their own resources." It will be a real accomplishment if he can make the agencies pull together in harness, with the community in the driver's seat.

Ever since the Port of New York Authority first announced its preference for a major jetport in the great swamp area of Morris County, N.J., the calm of that conservationists' paradise has been disturbed by almost continuous debate.

On a quieter note, but to me, equally disturbing, is the conflict among several Federal agencies, each with a different interest, as to the use of the great swamp area. The elimination of conflicts of this sort is one of the objectives of a bill I am introducing next week which would utilize existing programs of Federal financial assistance to help promote orderly community and regional growth in urban and suburban areas.

Since September 1960, the Department of the Interior has been acquiring land for its new National Wildlife Refuge to preserve the great swamp area in its present unspoiled form. But in July 1961 the Federal Aviation Agency publicly testified to the suitability of the great swamp area over other sites for the location of a fourth major airport for the greater New York area. And the Army Corps of Engineers, which is putting the finishing touches on a major flood control plan for the Passaic River Valley, proposes the drainage of the great swamp area and its consequent use for industrial and residential purposes as a partial justification for their proposal to build the Little Falls-Nutley tunnel to regulate overflow. Has there been consultation between these three separate Federal agencies? None is discernible.

Frequently lost sight of, I fear, are the will and the desires of the communities and the larger areas which would be affected by federally assisted public works projects.

The legislation which I propose would require the formulation of carefully coordinated, locally initiated community and regional land-use plans on a long-range basis before the Federal Government contributes tax dollars (often in the hundreds of millions) for any specific land-improvement or public works project.

And, by assigning to a single Federal official, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the responsibility for determining the extent of Federal financial participation in such locally initiated land-use plans, my bill would put an end to the present uncoordinated competition for land space by competing agencies.

Northern New Jersey residents will recall the controversy over the design of the East-West Freeway across Essex County as another example of lack of coordination between Federal agencies.

In that fight, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads refused to allow an additional several million dollars for the below-grade construction of this vital interstate route through Newark, Orange, and East Orange. But these communities protested the proposed elevated construction of this highway across their boundaries, pointing out correctly, in my judgment, that the extensive slum clearance and housing redevelopment going on in each of these cities—to which the Federal Government is contributing millions through the Housing Agency—would be jeopardized. For elevated structures tend to depress property values and create slums where they pass through already densely populated urban areas.

The freeway will, finally, be built below grade, even as was the Garden State Parkway through this highly urban area. But only an ingeniously devised local solution fought off the threat posed by a divided Federal responsibility—with no thanks due the Federal Government for the happy outcome.

My bill would attack these inconsistencies by expanding the workable program concept, which was initiated by former President Eisenhower. Under existing law, before Federal financial help for slum clearance, urban renewal or public housing is extended to any locality, the community itself must present a workable program for dealing with both the causes and the consequences of slums and urban decay. Once the community has presented an approved workable plan, the Federal Government makes available its various resources for individual projects.

Why confine this sensible requirement for planning to federally aided housing projects alone? Under my bill, after 2 years, no Federal funds would be made available to a community unless the project—whether it be for a new airport, water system, sewage treatment plant, intercepting sewer or other public works projects—is consistent with a locally drawn, long-range workable program.

And after 4 years, the Housing Administrator may, as appropriate, require a workable program for urban areas as a whole.

Not only would the bill encourage coordination of local plans on an areawide basis, help resolve conflicts among Federal agencies and eliminate much duplication of effort and wasteful spending, but it would restore the initiative to the community, the county, the urban area and the State for the best utilization of their own resources.

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

The bill (S. 915) to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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 expanding population pressures in many of the Nation's metropolitan areas frequently result in developmental activities which are poorly planned, uncoordinated, and wasteful. Projects undertaken without adequate coordination and planning too often serve conflicting purposes or fail to meet future needs. Where careful planning and coordination between interested agencies precedes the undertaking of projects, costly mistakes can be avoided and the realization of desirable goals hastened. The Federal Government assists the States and their localities through a variety of programs in the financing of many of these projects. It has a vital concern, therefore, in the manner in which they are carried out, and a responsibility to insure, insofar as is possible, that public moneys are expended to best serve the public interest. It is the purpose of this Act to encourage careful and coordinated planning and programing of federally assisted projects in metropolitan areas, and to requi e, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act.—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(2) The term "land-use project" means the undertaking of an urban renewal or public housing project, the acquisition of land to be used as open-space land (as defined in section 706 of the Housing Act of 1961), or the construction of any public work or facility, including, without limitation, any

highway, airport, or other transportation facility.

(3) The term "workable program" means an official plan of action, as it exists from time to time, meeting such standards as the Administrator may by regulation require, for the programing and undertaking, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects within a metropolitan area.

(4) The term "metropolitan area" means an area defined as such for the purposes of this Act by the Administrator.

SEC. 3. Except as provided in section 4, no Federal loan or grant for any land-use project in a locality within a metropolitan area shall be made after the expiration of two years after the date of enactment of this Act (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to the expiration of such two-year period), unless (1) there has been prepared and presented to the Administrator a workable program for such area, (2) on the basis of his review of such program, the Administrator determines that such project is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such program, and (3) the Administrator certifies that the assistance requested is in conformity with such program.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall by regulation designate those metropolitan areas where he determines that the undertaking of land-use projects, on a coordinated basis, requires planning on an areawide or regional basis by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered, under State or local laws or interstate compact, to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the metropolitan area within which any such project is to be undertaken. No Federal loan or grant for any land-use project in any area so designated shall be made, after the expiration of four years from the date on which the regulation designating such area becomes effective (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to the expiration of such four-year period) unless (1) there has been prepared and presented to the Administrator by an agency of the type hereinabove described a workable program for the area, (2) on the basis of his review of such program, the Administrator determines that such project is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such program, and (3) the Administrator certifies that the assistance requested is in conformity with such program.

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall cause any certification required to be made under this Act with respect to any Federal assistance administered by an agency other than the Housing and Home Finance Agency to be forwarded promptly to the head of the department or agency concerned.

(b) In the performance of his function under this Act, the Administrator shall maintain close liaison with departments and agencies of the Government administering programs affected by this Act.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting in the fifth sentence, after the word "includes", the following: "(1) the preparation of workable programs for the undertaking of land-use projects in metropolitan areas, and (2)".

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the administration bill to assist in the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 18, 1963.

HON. LYNDON JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am submitting with this letter a draft bill, the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963," to establish a long-range program of assistance to urban areas in solving their mass transportation problems. The bill is based on the mass transportation legislation which I proposed last year and which was formally reported—but not brought to a vote of the full membership—in both Houses.

Urban mass transportation is one of the most urgent problems facing the Nation and this Congress. As I said in my recent message on the state of the Union, "Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of our land, and if mass transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities, it needs Federal stimulation and assistance."

It is a Federal responsibility, particularly in this field, to encourage balanced use of all modes of transportation to the end that there may be satisfactory service at minimum cost. A long-range program of Federal assistance for mass transportation is urgently needed, so that local communities may freely decide for themselves the proper balance of local public investment in highways and in mass transportation systems, whether rail or bus.

As indicated in the attached letter from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, language is being prepared dealing with the subject of protecting the rights and interests of employees who might be adversely affected by projects undertaken or assisted by the mass transportation program and will be transmitted to the appropriate committees at the earliest possible opportunity. It is our expectation that the Secretary of Labor will discuss this very important subject in detail in testimony on the bill.

Enclosed also are a section-by-section summary of the bill and an outline of its major features.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

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

The bill (S. 917) 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, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CANTON RESERVOIR PROJECT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of the Canton project in Oklahoma.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to that project be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 918) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

CANTON PROJECT

The Canton Reservoir project was authorized in 1938. Construction was started in 1940, was interrupted by the war, and the project completed in 1948. At the time the project was authorized, it was estimated to cost $12,300,000. It actually was completed for $10,300,000, or $2 million less than the estimate.

When the project was planned, the Corps of Engineers recognized the necessity of including conservation storage for irrigation and, as a result of negotiations of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, not only was 100,000 acre-feet of storage, above the flood control requirements, added to the project but the outlet works for release of irrigation water were built into the dam.

A paragraph from the House document, used as a basis of authorization of the project states: "Further analysis in connection with the maximum utilization of the stream flow with respect to its conservation at Canton by storage indicates that the practical efficient limit for this purpose is 100,000 acre-feet. Storage in this amount would insure an annual supply of 156,000 acre-feet needed for domestic use, dilution purposes, and irrigation or other uses."

The Bureau of Reclamation Project report of June 22, 1954 (H. Doc. 445, 83d Cong., 2d sess.) recommends the irrigation of 16,000 acres below the Canton Dam, and using the conservation storage for the project lands. The irrigation project is estimated at about $4,500,000, consisting of the main canals, laterals, and necessary drainage works. The annual charges would be about $72,000 for 70 years. Of the 16,000 acres almost one-third is Indian owned. The benefit-cost ration is 2 to 1.

The Canton Dam, as operated by the Corps of Engineers since its completion in 1948, has reduced flood damages by about $5 million. Other income from the project has been $125,000 from leasing of lands, and over $1,900,000 from leasing of storage space for municipal water supply. Thus, the Federal investment has paid more than 5½ percent per year. Add the return that will come from irrigation and it is easy to see that the annual return may reach 7½ or 8 percent.

In every Congress since 1946, bills have been introduced to bring the irrigation benefits nearer to reality. First there were bills to legislate the necessary storage in the Canton Reservoir, and 69,000 acre-feet of storage has so been designated. Still there remains the job of getting the irrigation project authorized.

The local people are to be commended for their long and determined efforts on this project. Less determined people would have given up years ago, but not so with these. They have cooperated fully with the State and Federal agencies to remove roadblocks.

There was the matter of securing the court adjudication of the water rights, which was completed in the District Court of Oklahoma County in December 1949.

There was the formation of the Canton Irrigation District by an overwhelming vote of the irrigation landowners on December, 15, 1945.

There was the job of getting the Bureau of Reclamation Survey Report to Congress. This was finally accomplished in 1953.

There were negotiations with the Indian Service relating to the 30 percent Indian-owned land in the project, and the tedious task of working out water supply problems with Oklahoma City and Enid.

All of this required leadership of the first order.

The job is not complete. The "climate" in Washington has improved.

Budget A47 with which we wrestled for years has been scuttled, and a more realistic approach has been adopted by this administration. The President in his budget message has said:

"Natural resources development is a key requisite to the present and future economic growth of the Nation.

"Land, water, and power resources: Most of these expenditures will be to continue construction of projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, and hydroelectric power. Related developments of recreational facilities and fish and wildlife resources will be carried forward. These projects represent investments which will yield benefits for years to come.

"With funds requested for 1964 the Corps of Engineers will initiate construction of 32 projects, the Bureau of Reclamation 8 new projects, and the Tennessee Valley Authority 2 new projects."

Here is the new view. We should build such projects as Canton. It fits into the pattern of developing our basic natural resources.

In the President's request for funds is an item of $200,000 for advance engineering and design for the Optima project on the North Canadian River upstream from Canton Reservoir. This project will provide 260,000 additional acre-feet of capacity which should insure the availability of 100,000 acre-feet of storage capacity for irrigation of 16,000 acres of land below Canton. At the same time no adverse effect will be had on flood control and water supply.

With these new developments, I am hopeful for favorable consideration and authorization of the Canton irrigation project as recommended in the bill I am introducing.

PROGRAM TO REDUCE NONBENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USE OF WATER, PECOS RIVER BASIN, NEW MEXICO AND TEXAS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide authority to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive uses of water in the Pecos River Basin in New Mexico and Texas.

I am sure the Members of the Senate are well aware of the importance of water in the arid regions of the western part of the United States. The studies of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources have shown that water shortage and water quality are not only a problem of the West but are becoming major problems elsewhere. We must therefore use every practical means at our command to solve these problems as quickly as possible if we are to provide water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic uses and for recreation purposes to meet the demands of the population.

We have in the Southwest a menace in the form of certain phreatophytes that is consuming nonbeneficially each year over 25 million acre-feet of our water. The principal culprit is a plant known as Tamarix gallicia, more commonly known as saltcedar. These plants were introduced into the United States from the Mediterranean region, east Asia, or India, where they are indigenous. The climate and other conditions of the West are ideal for the rapid growth of this plant and since 1914 it has spread to nearly all of the streambeds of the West and is spreading rapidly and now covers nearly 15 million acres of bottomlands in the 17 Western States.

We have initiated, through the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, a program on the Rio Grande above Elephant Butte Lake to remove some of these saltcedar and to build a floodway and channel into the lake. This project was started 11 years ago and during construction, up until 1961, has saved 550,000 acre-feet. The Bureau of Reclamation states that beginning this year they expect to save 100,000 acre-feet annually for Elephant Butte Reservoir. This project has already demonstrated that this type of water salvage work is profitable.

The Pecos River Basin is one of the most heavily infested river basins in the West. From 600 acres found in the McMillan Delta in 1915, the infested area has grown to 43,000 acres in 1957 and is well over that amount now. The National Resources Planning Board reported that the saltcedar in this area is consuming approximately 5 acre-feet of water per acre annually. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, these phreatophytes could consume virtually the entire flow of the Pecos River in this area in 50 years if the growth goes unreined.

Some of New Mexico's chief farming and population centers lie in the Pecos Valley. The economic growth of this area and the Red Bluff area in Texas will be greatly hampered unless we can provide an increased supply of water. Due to drought and the consumption of water by these wasters New Mexico has become indebted in the amount of 60,000 acre-feet to Texas under the provisions of the Pecos River compact. It is hoped that when this project is completed New Mexico will be able to repay its debt with the increased supply of water, and at the same time improve the economy of the entire area dependent upon the Pecos for water.

One thing is certain: Further delay in dealing with this problem will give rise to additional problems and greatly increase the cost of eradication and control work as well as curtail the economic growth of the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the joint resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas for many years there has been an inadequate supply of water for established uses in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas; and

Whereas the growth of saltcedar (tamarix pentandra) and other undesirable phreatophytes in the Pecos River Basin is responsible for the nonbeneficial consumption of tens of thousands of acre feet of water annually; and

Whereas the prolific growth of saltcedar and other nonbeneficial phreatophytes has progressively intensified the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas in addition to consuming great quantities of water annually, the growth of such nonbeneficial vegetation also interferes with water flow and canal maintenance, clogs stream channels, and creates flood hazards; and

Whereas many water users that have heretofore entered into repayment contracts for the construction of works are now facing hardships in meeting their financial obligations as a result of the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas the problem of nonbeneficial consumptive use of water by vegetation has become so severe and widespread that State and local interests are incapable of effectively combating it; and

Whereas there is a continuing need for actions to aid in conversion from nonbeneficial to beneficial use of the water; and

Whereas it is estimated that if such vegetative growth in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas is not controlled, such growth will consume practically the entire flow of the Pecos River within the next fifty years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to prevent further decreases in the supply of water in the Pecos River Basin, and in order to increase and protect such water supply for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recreational uses, and for the conservation of fish and wildlife, and to provide protection for the farmlands in such basin from the hazards of floods, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to take such measures as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out a continuing program to reduce the nonbeneficial consumption of water in the basin, including that by salt cedar and other undesirable phreatophytes. Such program shall be carried out in the Pecos River Basin from its headwaters in New Mexico to the town of Girvin, Texas: *Provided, however,* That no money shall be appropriated for and no work commenced on the clearing of the floodway authorized by the Act of February 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 17) unless provision shall have been made to replace any Carlsbad Irrigation District terminal storage which might be lost by the clearing of said floodway.

SEC. 2. As a condition to undertaking the program authorized by the first section of this joint resolution, the Secretary shall require the States of New Mexico and Texas to give such assurances as he deems adequate that such States will acquire such lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other interests in lands as the Secretary considers necessary effectively to carry out such program.

SEC. 3. (a) As a further condition to undertaking the program authorized by this joint resolution, the Secretary may, with respect to those beneficiaries in New Mexico and Texas which the Secretary determines to be likely to benefit directly from the results of such program, require such commitments as he deems appropriate that

such beneficiaries will repay the United States so much of the reimbursable costs incurred by it in carrying out such program as do not exceed the value of the benefits accruing to such beneficiaries from such program. The Secretary shall not require the repayment of such costs unless he determines that it is feasible (1) to identify the beneficiaries that are directly benefited by the program, and (2) to measure the extent to which each beneficiary is benefited by such program.

(b) Repayment contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, except that the amount of the repayment installment in the case of any beneficiary shall be fixed by the Secretary in accordance with the ability of such beneficiary to pay, taking into consideration all other financial obligations of such beneficiary.

(c) Any costs of the program which the Secretary determines should be assigned to flood control, recreation, or restoration of stream flow shall not be included in computing the costs properly allocable to the beneficiaries under this section, but shall be considered as nonreimbursable costs.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to abrogate, amend, modify, or be in conflict with any provisions of the Pecos River compact.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, just a few days ago I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to certain activities engaged in by the Central Intelligence Agency, and their impact on U.S. security and foreign policy.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon expressed the view that this Agency should be under a measure of congressional control. This is a view I share with him, and, have been of such a mind for a long time.

As far back as the 1st session of the 84th Congress, in 1955, I cosponsored a concurrent resolution introduced by the now majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because, I, too, believed that no agency of the Government spending taxpayers' funds should be free to do as it pleases without the Congress maintaining its proper measure of control.

There has been criticism about the Central Intelligence Agency over the years concerning its activities and its failure to make any report to the Congress. It should not necessarily be placed under congressional control, but it should periodically be subjected to congressional scrutiny.

We all realize this Agency annually spends approximately billions. There have been, and will be, those who say this Agency's activities are so secret—no one should know—in the interests of national security. However, this is not a valid argument.

No harm was done from the standpoint of security or in maintaining secrecy in connection with the development of the atomic bomb. A joint congressional committee of the Congress certainly maintained this secret, while at the same time it promoted the best interests of the Nation in maintaining a watchdog setup over the Atomic Energy Commission.

I feel as many other Members of Congress that there should be a congressional watchdog committee to look over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. I think it is in the public interest that such a committee be appointed.

To achieve this objective, I am submitting at this time a concurrent resolution which would establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to be composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives; not more than four Members appointed from either the Senate or the House shall be of the same political party.

The measure provides that the committee would make continuing studies of the activities of this Agency and the problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security, and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government.

In turn, the Central Intelligence Agency would be required to keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this resolution is referred will take prompt and favorable action on it.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution remain at the desk for a period of 3 days so that any of my colleagues who would like to join with me as cosponsors may do so.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the six members to be appointed from the Senate, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. Of the six members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than four members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of such services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

DUTIES ON IMPORTS OF CATTLE, BEEF, AND VEAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 557) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 28, 1963.

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

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a reprinting of the bill S. 558 and the Senate Joint Resolution, S.J. Res. 30, which deal with our educational and cultural exchange programs, and which I introduced on January 28 of this year, that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as a cosponsor. During the last meeting of the NATO parliamentary conference in Paris last November the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I served as members of the American delegation to the NATO parliamentary committee dealing with education and cultural exchange programs. The Senator from West Virginia made some very valuable contributions during the NATO conference. He saw these bills in the RECORD. I did not confer with anyone before introducing them. The Senator from West Virginia would like to become a cosponsor, and I would be honored and happy to have him join me as a cosponsor of the measures.

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

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MEASURING DEVICES IN POSTAL SERVICE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 720) to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by me on February 6, 1963.

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

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as cosponsors to the bill S. 736, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works, and to the bill S. 737, to promote water and air pollution control and abatement by authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide certain assistance to small business concerns in obtaining necessary treatment works.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 816) providing for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, submitted by me on February 18, 1963.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I welcome the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut as a cosponsor. We are delighted to have his support and are glad to have him identified with this effort to secure legislation.

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 11, 1963:

S. 774. 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 distinguished brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes: Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

Authority of February 20, 1963:

S. 869. A bill to authorize the burial of certain news correspondents in national cemeteries: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. Moss.

Authority of February 21, 1963:

S. 880. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries: Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. NELSON.

THE WILDERNESS BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the names of Senators BARTLETT, BENNETT, CANNON, DOMINICK, FONG, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, JORDAN of Idaho, LAUSCHE, MECHEM, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, SIMPSON, and THURMOND were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment submitted by Mr. ALLOTT on February 20, 1963, to the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of New York, for a term of 4 years—recess appointment.

Homer Lester Benson, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for term expiring September 30, 1968—recess appointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, March 4, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 5, 1963, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Pennsylvania—recess appointment.

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge, district of New Mexico, vice Carl A. Hatch, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Washington's Birthday address by Senator STENNIS, delivered on February 22, 1963, at Richmond, Va., together with the introduction by Senator ROBERTSON.

VISIT BY THE KING OF LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President and the people of the United States today have the honor of greeting the King of Laos, his Majesty Sri Savang Vatthana. It has been my privilege to know the King of Laos for over a decade, and, I believe, to understand and appreciate the difficulties and the complex problems which have been his, and, quite likely, will continue to confront him in the years ahead.

He is fully aware of the difficulties which face Laos, and is prepared to serve as a catalyst to help solve them. With his dignity, prestige, knowledge, and understanding, he is extremely well qualified to preside over a reunification of his country and to attend to the needs and the wants of his people.

We are indeed happy to have him as our guest, Mr. President; and, on behalf of the Senate of the United States, I extend to him our greetings, our cordial

best wishes, and our hope that the friendship between our two countries will continue on the basis of mutual cordiality and understanding, and that the future of Laos will be enhanced and strengthened as a free, independent, and wholly sovereign nation.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 14th annual International Pancake Day Race will be run tomorrow. This great good-will event between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, is always held on the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday.

This race is sponsored by the junior chamber of commerce of Liberal, for the promotion of international relations between England and the United States. It is based on competition between the young ladies of Olney, England, and the young ladies of Liberal, Kans.

Some years ago the people of Liberal heard of this 500-year event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church. The city of Liberal challenged the women of Olney, England, to this race; and the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, the Vicar of Olney.

In old England, it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell, to be "shriven" of their sins. In 1445, a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang; but she hurried off to the "shriving," carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus, an annual sporting event was born.

I am inviting the Members of the U.S. Senate and their staffs, the Kansas congressional delegation, and the press to be my guests tomorrow morning, for breakfast in the Senate dining rooms, here in the Capitol, where they will be served the finest pancakes in the world, made from the finest flour in the world, furnished by the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, directly from the "Pancake Hub of the Universe."

Mrs. Vicki Campbell, a Liberal, Kans., housewife and mother of two young children, is in Washington, to help with this breakfast. Mrs. Campbell won the Liberal Pancake Race last year, and is here representing the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has asked unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from South Dakota with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

UNITED NATIONS AID TO CUBA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion about the wisdom and justification of the United Nations, through its Special Fund, giving aid to Cuba. Within the last few days I heard a number of comments and read some articles contending that our Government, in objecting to the grant-of-aid out of the Special Fund to Cuba, was making a serious mistake. I do not agree with that view. In my judgment, the United Nations grant-of-aid to Cuba out of the Special Fund would perpetrate a direct affront upon the United States.

My reasons for making that statement are as follows: I recognize that the Special Fund set up in the United Nations is contemplated for use in helping distressed people around the world, keeping in mind that political and ideological leanings should not be considered. Recognizing fully that principle as being in force, I still am of the opinion that the Special Fund should not have been made available to Castro and his communistic government.

I direct the attention of the Senate to a bit of the statistical background of the United Nations Special Fund. It is a voluntary Fund created by the contributions of various nations of the world. From 1959, the date of the establishment of the Fund, down to 1963, the sum of $251 million has been expended from the Special Fund of the United Nations. Of that $251 million, the U.S. Government put up $100,400,000, or 40 percent of the amount.

In the same period all of the Communist nations of the world, including Yugoslavia, pledged the total sum of $8,228,225. Red Russia pledged and put up $5 million. We pledged and put up $100 million. The other Communist nations, consisting of Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Mongolia, Rumania, Ukraine, Cuba, and Yugoslavia put up $8,228,225.

I repeat that the total contributed by all the Communist countries to the special fund was $8,228,225. Our Government alone contributed $100,400,000.

Cuba is a member of the United Nations. It pledged $55,000 for the Special Fund, as follows: $5,000 in 1960, nothing in 1961, $25,000 in 1962, and $25,000 in 1963, making a total of $55,000.

Of the $55,000 pledged, Cuba has not paid 1 penny. It has paid not 1 penny of its obligation to finance the operations in the Gaza Strip and in the Congo. It is in arrears in the payment of its normal assessments for the management of the United Nations. As of this date Cuba is in arrears $496,000 of its obligations to the United Nations. It has paid practically nothing.

Two or three months ago Cuba paid $160,000 of its arrearage in the special operating assessments because it wanted to avoid being expelled.

Let us keep in mind the picture. Cuba is in arrears $496,000, and has paid not 1 penny of its pledges for the Special Fund and not 1 penny for its obligations in maintaining the operations of the United Nations in the Congo and in the Gaza Strip. Cuba wants the benefit of the work of the United Nations and of the funds of the United Nations but does not wish to bear its obligations.

Let us see what is contemplated by way of aid to Cuba. The item which is immediately in controversy is a $1,157,000 grant out of the Special Fund to help the Cuban Communist government solve its agricultural problems. There have also been pledged to the Government of Cuba two other sums. In the 1961–62 financial period, Cuba is programed to receive $445,883 covering 10 projects to be carried out in Cuba by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization; the International Labor Organization; the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; and the World Health Organization. In addition to the sums I have already mentioned—$1,157,000 and the last sum of $445,883—there is programed an additional sum of $405,780. The program to be covered by this third sum envisages $69,000 for an ILO social security project in Cuba, $160,000 for an FAO fisheries project, $54,000 for a UNESCO marine biological project, $13,500 for a UNESCO education project, $17,280 for an ICAO civil aviation project, and $152,000 for the WHO public health work.

As closely as I have been able to figure out, since Castro became the chief of Cuba and since the Communists have taken over, Cuba has paid into the United Nations $160,000 and is in arrears in the sum of $496,000, while Cuba is to receive the sum of $2.2 million. With due respect to some who are trying to justify this action on the part of the United Nations, I must say that what is being done does not reconcile itself with my concept of fairness and decency either to the people of the United States or to the people of the world.

Castro and his Communist government want all of the benefits which can be provided by the United Nations without being willing to bear any of the obligations.

Our Government has put up $100 million, while all of the Communist governments of the world, in 5 years, as I have indicated, have pledged $8,228,000, and, as I have said, Castro is in arrears $496,000.

One can recognize the charter provisions that there should be no decision made on the basis of ideology and politics, but there were grounds to make a decision that Cuba was in arrears, was flouting its responsibilities to the United Nations, and therefore was not entitled to the charity and beneficence of the citizens of the United States.

Finally, this is an affront and an insult to every taxpayer of the United States. In effect, it states to the U.S. citizen, "You give. We will not hold others even morally responsible, but you must continue with your charity and observe your high ethical principles, regardless of the insults perpetrated upon you."

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio is saying and the point he is making at this particular time. I presume the Senator would be in favor of Cuba and the other nations which are in arrears either paying up or getting out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want them to make an honest effort to pay their obligations and pledges; not to adopt the position that they shall give nothing and take everything.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator thoroughly. I think they ought to be given a certain time limit in the near future to pay up. Then, of course, they would be in good standing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The United Nations now has a provision that if a nation is in arrears for 2 years with respect to a certain category of obligations it must step out, and that is the only reason why the Communist government of Cuba paid the sum of $160,000 recently, while remaining in debt and in arrearage in the sum of $496,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would not the Senator be in favor of nations in arrears not being allowed to receive money out of any United Nations fund until they pay up?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator emphatically.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MEDICAL CARE AND WYOMING'S LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in regard to the upcoming debate on a federally controlled program of medical care for the Nation's aged, I am proud to report an action by Wyoming's distinguished governor, Clifford Hansen, and the 1963 State legislature, in providing an enabling act for the Kerr-Mills medical care law.

This enabling act was signed into law by Governor Hansen February 14. It had cleared Wyoming's Senate without a dissenting vote, and was passed by the house of representatives with a comfortable 39 to 16 margin.

The Equality State's Kerr-Mills law will provide $570,000 in State funds which will be matched by Federal funds for the first 2 years of the program.

Unlike the proposal backed by the administration, this Wyoming approved Kerr-Mills program will not be under tight or arbitrary Federal control.

It is a voluntary program in which no aged person is forced to participate. I consider the action of Wyoming's Legislature in implementing the Kerr-Mills approach to medical care for its senior citizens an outstanding example of what a State can do to handle its own medical problems with Government assistance but without Government excesses or control.

In the context of this subject, I request unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with this statement, an editorial by the noted columnist David Lawrence, who with great candor and fairness points out the pitfalls of a federally dominated, mandatory medical care program.

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

FEDERAL HAND IN MEDICAL CARE—ADMINISTRATION PLAN CRITICIZED AS LIKELY TO INTENSIFY SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

(By David Lawrence)

It's going to be harder to get a doctor when you are sick, harder to get into a hospital, and harder to take care of the young as well as the old who become ill in the future—if the Federal Government intervenes in the field of medical care as just recommended to Congress by President Kennedy.

Time was when, if you were sick, you could get a doctor to come to your home. Today most patients have to go to the doctor's office except when gravely ill.

There simply aren't enough doctors now. This is primarily because medical aid is covered in part by private insurance plans that make it less costly. Persons who used to take care of minor ailments themselves often seek medical aid nowadays. The insurance idea, itself, is a good one. But until the shortage of doctors produced by the existing plans is overcome, the proposed intervention by the Federal Government with free medical care for certain age groups will only intensify the problem for almost everybody. Elderly persons require individual care and continuous observation, but if there is a shortage of physicians, these patients will be neglected, no matter how much of the bill the Government is willing to pay.

It's good politics, of course, for any President to champion social-welfare legislation, but free medical attention for millions of citizens will constitute in the field of welfare benefits the biggest single expense imposed on all the people.

Taxes are to be raised to finance the medical plan proposed by the President. Not only will everybody's social security rates go up, but the tax will be imposed on the first $5,200 of salary instead of the current figure of $4,800 a year. The purpose, of course, is to collect about $10 billion more over the next 5 years. Just what this does to the administration program for a "tax cut" is not readily calculated, but it is another example of how the much-talked-about "tax cut" is rapidly turning into a tax rise.

With the objective of the President's plan—to provide medical care for the aged—there will be little dissent. But the question really is whether those families which can afford to take care of their own aged members shall be required to pay taxes to support a plan in which their own relatives—though able to afford the medical care—would get it at Government expense.

The medical care agitation will, moreover, raise false hopes. The proposed plan doesn't cover medical treatment but mostly the charges for hospitalization and related services. The political value, however, of proclaiming "medical care for the aged" will continue to be there, and it's politics that's really back of the whole crusade.

The vast majority of doctors are vehemently opposed to the new plan. They feel it will demoralize the whole system of medical care in America, and they ought to know. They constitute a dedicated profession. They are on call in serious cases at the hospitals or at private homes day and night. They must be precise in their findings, because errors can be fatal.

The members of the profession are men and women who know medical conditions in this country and are familiar also with what "socialized medicine has meant in various other countries. They fear that the new plan some day will result in "socialized medicine"—a scheme in which the Government runs the medical-care program, pays the fees of doctors and standardizes their incomes. The administration denies that its plan will ever bring "socialized medicine," but the doctors know that, if the medical profession is overwhelmed with cases due to the free service programs provided by the Government, the demand on the time of all doctors will be so great that the Government will have to step in to try to bring order out of the chaos that will ensue.

Nobody objects to better medical care for the aged, as, well as for everybody else, but there are serious differences of opinion as to whether those who seek to make political capital of the issue will produce frustration in the medical profession and a lowering of the high standards of medical care which have long prevailed in America.

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the war in South Vietnam is very remote to most of us and its meaning is limited to what we read in the newspapers or hear about it on television and radio. I have been fortunate enough to be there and thus to realize some of the conditions there.

But none of us here in the U.S. Senate really know what our servicemen are going through there—and I doubt if we really have a true appreciation of what they are doing.

Lt. Douglas Emery, a graduate of the University of Maine, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland, Maine, is one of our servicemen fighting in South Vietnam.

He has written one of the most unforgettable letters I have ever read. It is a very moving letter about the deep appreciation that the free people of Vietnam have of our aid to them.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter, and an article in the Waterville, Maine, Morning Sentinel of January 31, 1963, be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point—and I urge all Members to read it.

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

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel, Jan. 31, 1963]

HARTLAND LIEUTENANT WRITES HOME OF LIFE IN VIETNAM SERVICE

The following letter was received from Lt. Douglass Emery, son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland.

Lieutenant Emery graduated from the University of Maine in June 1959 when he was commissioned second lieutenant. In November he went to Fort Benning, Ga., for training and in February 1960 he arrived at Fort Dix, N.J. While at Fort Dix, N.J., he received his commission as first lieutenant, and served as company commander until May 1962.

He left for Fort Bragg, N.C., in June for a 4-week training in guerrilla warfare, and then went to Monterey, Calif., to a language school for 5 weeks' training before going to South Vietnam.

From Saigon he went to the northern part of South Vietnam to Quang Tri where the headquarters were located. From there he went to Tabat, an outpost, and then to Ashau, about 20 miles away, which was another outpost. He expects to return to Tabat soon.

The rainy weather makes it necessary to wait for the landing of a plane to pick up the mail where he is located. Also the delivery of mail, which is dropped from a helicopter, brings much delayed correspondence, since in January of this year he has just received some of his Christmas mail.

Lieutenant Emery's period of service in Vietnam is 1 year, and he arrived there about September 1, 1962.

The letter:

"THANKSGIVING 1962.

"DEAREST MUM AND DAD: It's Thanksgiving night of 1962, approximately 8 p.m.—you will be just getting up to prepare for Thanksgiving Day. I have a very beautiful, heartwarming story to tell you, despite all the ironies involved. Please excuse my messy writing, as I can hardly hold my eyes open.

"This afternoon we returned from a 2-day patrol during which we had a pretty rough time. We lived on cold boiled rice balls, and it poured continuously by the buckets; we were getting very discouraged, cold, wet, and hungry.

"My cigarettes were ruined when we swam two rivers, and I shared the bamboo pipe of the fellow whom I mentioned in my last letter. The leeches were clamping onto us by the dozens, and we had to stop often to pull them off each other. We were all bleeding from at least 25 little holes caused by the leeches.

"On our way back, we were ambushed by the Viet Cong. After this deal we continued back with the rifles, grenades, papers, letters, etc., of the enemy dead (whom we buried), and carrying our wounded (and dead).

"When we got back to base, I undressed from my drenched clothing, pulled the remaining leeches off, and wrapped in a blanket, which was the only dry thing around, I lit a dry cigarette, feeling damn sick, scared, and homesick. As I sat there, Lieutenant Liem came and told me that Captain Tung (battalion commander) wanted to see me immediately.

"Still wrapped in my blanket, and wondering what I had done wrong, I ran barefoot through the rain to Captain Tung's hut. As I went in I was greeted by this scene:

"In the middle of the hut, there was a small bamboo table laden with rice, big pieces of deer meat, duck meat, tea, and one tin cup with one swallow of whiskey (all they had) in front of my bowl of rice. Seated around the table were the company commanders, Lieutenant Suu, the battalion intelligence officer, and Lieutenant Liem, the battalion executive (who ran to his seat as soon as I made room in the doorway for him) and Captain Tung, who stood at the head of the table. The whole room was illuminated by one candle made of pig fat and rope.

"I stood with my mouth hanging open (with 2-day's beard plus my moustache), not knowing what to say. Captain Tung put his hand on my shoulder and said: (If I remember correctly, for my head was clouded with joy, and my eyes were clouded with tears. Bear in mind, he speaks only that English he has learned from me, Captain Lynch and Sergeant Sink). 'We learn from history today great holiday in America. Not much hours back, we fight other men like us, and many of them and us die. Possible some of them are family men of us, but they learn wrong. It is very sad we must fight but c'est la guerre' (in French, 'that is war'). Now we have very bad food, but we make this meal to bless you, your father, mother, and family because they give us great American man to help us fight for freedom like America has. We love you, we ask you to forgive our simple ways' (simple ways? Elegant people, only by different culture), 'and we ask you to be blessed by Buddha and Christ, the Lord.'

"Then Captain Tung led me out in the pouring rain where all the troops stood, soaking wet, where they said in unison, something I could not understand.

"Captain Tung interpreted: 'May the seven bright paths of Buddha show you the way to Eternal Life, fellow man.' (The seven paths of Buddha are so much like the Ten Commandments, one can interpret them as the same.) I cried. Then we crawled back into the hut to eat the most beautiful and delicious Thanksgiving dinner I have ever had.

"I did not mean to tell you about the sickening part of death, but it was part of this most beautiful story that I could not keep from you. So, you see, I'm halfway around the world from my loved ones, yet the spirit of love and brotherhood brings us together—at least, by heart. I would like everyone in the family to read this, as I think it is worthwhile to all of us.

"Happy Thanksgiving to all the family, and

"Lots of love,

"DOUG."

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Estonians form one of the smallest and most distinct ethnic groups in all Europe, numbering slightly more than a million in their historic homeland in a northeastern corner of the continent. These rough and rugged peasants and shrewd traders have always struggled for their individual freedom and national independence. Their struggle did not cease when they were brought under the powerful autocracy of Russian czars early in the 18th century. From then on they were the oppressed subjects of the czars, their chance for freedom coming only after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917. Early the next year they proclaimed their national independence. That historic event of February 24, 1918, marked a turning point in Estonia's modern history, and thus began a new era for its people.

Under the democratic form of government then established in free Estonia the people worked and lived happily for a little over two decades. During that relatively short time they succeeded in making Estonia a progressive, prosperous model democracy. Then came the Second World War, bringing with it misfortune and tragedy. In 1940 the country was invaded and overrun by the Red army, and in August of that year it was made part of the Soviet Union. Since then the people of Estonia have been prisoners of totalitarian tyranny in their homeland. Even under such abominable circumstances they still yearn for their freedom. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we wish we could be of some aid to them in their struggle. Unfortunately, as I have stated on an earlier occasion, we are not in position to extend them effective aid now. But we ardently hope and pray for these freedom-loving and freedom-seeking people, for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE TO PLACE LUMBER INDUSTRY ON COMPETITIVE BASIS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, just in the last few days the lumber industry of the United States was the victim of a decision by the Federal Tariff Commission which is going to result in continued depressive prices for American lumber producers. The decision to which I refer is the one which the lumber industry had brought before the Commission dealing with imports of Canadian lumber and the effect of those imports are having on the prices of our own homegrown lumber.

The Legislature of South Dakota has taken note of this action by the Tariff Commission and has approved a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to initiate action to place our lumber industry on an equal and competitive basis with foreign manufactures through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment and loss of taxes to the deterioration of our local communities.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the President will take the necessary steps to protect our great American lumber industry and if he does not that then the Congress will take the steps through enactment of legislation to protect the industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the entire concurrent resolution as adopted by the South Dakota Legislature.

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

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States regarding the lumber industry in the United States

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay high wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canadian, due to the latter's advantages, including: Depreciated currency; low stumpage rates; noncompetitive bidding; less costly and restrictive forest practices; lower wage rates; high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada; low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; a cooperative government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the representatives in the Congress from the State of South Dakota.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker of the House.
W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk.
NILS A. BOE,
President of the Senate.
NILLS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

ARE THERE PIRATES IN THE INDIANA DUNES?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Chicago's American and its extremely capable staff reporter, C. Owsley Shepherd, have just completed a probing independent study of the alleged economic feasibility of the proposed Burns Ditch Harbor.

The American carried last weekend on its front pages a series of three searching articles which Mr. Shepherd based on his study of this question. The series is one of the finest expositions which has appeared on this very complicated subject, both with respect to the question of the economic feasibility of public works projects in general and with respect to Burns Ditch in particular.

The American cannot be praised too highly for its willingness to commit its expert resources to a thorough examination of a difficult and technical subject, even though that subject is severely controversial and any attempt to get at the facts is likely to bring on the wrath of powerful interests. Indiana and the Midwest should be grateful that such fearless and vigorous journalism still is carried on.

Mr. President, all Members of Congress have been in the position of both promoting and opposing public works proposals, so we all know a little of the intricacies which often are part of the economic studies put forward to support public works projects. Knowing this, Mr. Shepherd's exacting work in getting the relevant facts and his lucid presentation of them will be well appreciated. I commend it to the citizens of Indiana and of other States. I believe the press of Indiana would do well to publish more of this material since in general they have not given a full account of all the issues at stake.

These articles speak forcefully for themselves of the very doubtful justifications provided for the harbor which would destroy the irreplaceable Indiana Dunes at great cost for the almost sole benefit of two selfish steel companies. Nevertheless, I would make one addition. While it often appears that the Corps of Engineers have put forward questionable or inaccurate data, the fact is that these data are supplied by the so-called local interests—in this case the Indiana Port Commission, National and Bethlehem Steel, and certain Porter County interests—and the Corps has been made the fall guy because the local interests say "you have to take our word" and "you challenge our sovereignty if you ask for proof." Therefore, while criticisms of information in the Engineers' reports appear to apply to the District Engineer, it should be understood that in large part his hands have been tied by powerful local interests.

While Mr. Shepherd in part discusses questions which the Save the Dunes Council lawyers, other conservationists, and I have raised, his study is truly independent in that he has dug out new and devastating information. For example, he has gone into the question of tug costs, on which crucial alleged benefits have been based, and has acquired expert testimony that the certain development of bow-power thrust will wipe out alleged savings due to tug costs. He has also determined that no commitments exist which assure that the largest source of alleged benefits; namely, the Rail-to-Water Transfer Corp., of Chicago, will in fact be switched to Burns Ditch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three articles which appeared in Chicago's American for February 21, 22, and 23, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 21, 1963]

COVERUP OF DUNES HARBOR FACTS?—THE DUNES—HAVEN FOR PIRATES?

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

(NOTE.—Why has the U.S. Budget Bureau locked up special reports by the Army's Corps of Engineers which might affect the current Dunes Harbor controversy in Indiana? As Congress awaits action by the Bureau on the Burns Ditch Harbor proposal, expected to cost taxpayers more than $25 million in Federal funds if approved, Chicago's American publishes a special analysis of the mysterious engineering reports. This is the first of a series.)

Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana, is charged with seeking downstate support for an economic development fund, 71 percent of which would go for a harbor at Burns Ditch, by emphasizing that proposed projects include two Ohio River bridges.

The allegation was made by the Fort Wayne chapter of the Izaak Walton League, whose president, Sam Ropchan, said "this strikes us as a misrepresentation."

The chapter introduced a resolution opposing the development fund at a public hearing in Indianapolis last night conducted by two legislative committees studying Welsh's proposal to double the 3-cent cigarette tax.

DOUGLAS FIGHTS

Under the administration plan, the added revenue from a tax increase would go to the proposed $35,435,800 fund, of which $25.5 million is earmarked for dredging and building outer breakwaters for a dunelands port.

Welsh has said that Indiana would be reimbursed should the Federal Government decide to pay for these portions of the $68 million harbor.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, leader of conservationists in Washington opposed to the Burns Ditch project, charges Welsh is attempting to rush a start on a port to confront dissidents with an accomplished fact before Congress has had an opportunity to vote on the matter.

Although a recommendation for Federal participation was submitted more than a year ago by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, it still is being analyzed by the Bureau of the Budget.

The proposed harbor would run between properties owned by the Midwest and Bethlehem Steel Cos. The corps in part bases its economic justification for its recommendation on projected benefits to steel interests if a public port were built instead of their having to build their own.

DOUGLAS CHARGES FAKE

Two savings totaling $270,000, the Engineers say, would result from eliminating vessel delays caused by wave action and storms.

Senator DOUGLAS alleges these estimates "obviously are faked."

DOUGLAS protests that for a year the corps has refused to furnish him with detailed calculations, proof that it studied alternate sites, or copies of secret agreements between the State of Indiana and the steel interests.

The Illinois Senator, who has introduced a bill for the Interior Department to acquire 9,000 acres of dunelands to be preserved in a national park, has appealed to the Budget Bureau to get information from the corps on 12 specific points he challenges.

PIRATE INDUSTRY

In a letter to Elmer Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau, DOUGLAS demands to know if the Army Engineers and other groups "have conspired to pirate away an Illinois industry in order to justify the Burns Ditch proposal and destroy the dunes."

This reference is to the corps analysis of the alleged effect of the improvement upon the activities of the Rail to Water Transfer Corp., an association of 28 Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky producers, which transfers coal from rail cars to ships at its docks at East 101st Street and the Calumet River.

The corps estimates the harbor would handle 5 million tons of coal shipments annually, and rail to water is the only concern in this part of the Midwest with access to such sizable supplies.

DOUGLAS says the corps uses this projected coal traffic as the chief anticipated source of revenue with which the State of Indiana could amortize $38 million in bonds to pay for land and facilities it is to provide.

Since economic justification for any such project is a prerequisite to Federal participation, Senator DOUGLAS states in his letter:

"The public is entitled to know whether these alleged benefits are nothing more than a wholesale pirating of coal transfer operations from an existing port to a proposed port which would serve the same area."

Engineers among the membership of the Save the Dunes Council, a group of conservationists, have made their own analysis of the feasibility recommendation issued in January 1962 by the Chicago district of the Army Engineers, as well as comparing it with the district's October 1960 report which was ordered withdrawn a month later.

In 1962, it was concluded shippers of coal, grain, and overseas general cargoes would save $610,000 a year through elimination of vessel delays and tug costs by using Burns Ditch instead of the Calumet River and harbor.

It also was figured that the steel interests would save $700,000 a year by not having to build an alternate private port, as well as $135,000 on each of two other factors. It is the latter two benefits which Senator DOUGLAS says "obviously are faked."

SIX CONCLUSIONS

The corps dealt at length in both reports on results of wave action. It listed six conclusions in the 1960 document and five of these were repeated verbatim in 1962. The one that was omitted read, "A westerly oriented entrance is considered undesirable." DOUGLAS says this is significant.

For purposes of comparison, the Army Engineers describe both the proposed public harbor and a private alternate. In dealing with the first, provision is made for only an easterly entrance. But the private port is depicted as having two entrances—one to the west.

The corps then says that the public undertaking would save $135,000 annually by eliminating lost time in unloading due to wave action in the berthing areas of the smaller port attributable to its westerly opening.

SAKE OF ECONOMY

The corps says it laid out the private project as it did for purposes of economy. The Illinois Senator scoffs at this as a specious claim.

The other $135,000 benefit item is credited to reducing delays in vessels entering the public harbor during storms.

Yet the corps states elsewhere that the port is not designed to provide areas for anchoring of ships that might require refuge because Calumet harbor furnishes such protection.

Besides, the conservationists point out, Bethlehem Steel wants to fill an area east of the proposed harbor and the length of future Great Lakes bulk carriers is expected to increase, which would add to the hazards of entering the port.

RAISE QUESTIONS

Experts for the Save the Dunes Council charge the "corps apparently found it necessary to create some fictitious benefits" in other areas. They raise these questions:

1. Why should an annual maintenance cost of $100,000 be set for each project when the private port would be much the smaller?

2. Why should all the riprap along the base of the breakwater cells be priced at $17 per ton for a private project, but be divided into filter stone at $6 and protection stone at $17 per ton for the public harbor?

3. Why should it take 39,000 tons of stone along the base of the cells for the 2,000-foot north breakwater of the private harbor, but only 34,500 tons for 5,376 feet along the base of the public breakwater?

4. Why should it cost virtually as much per foot of length for a private breakwater in water 27 feet deep as for the public project in a depth of 42.2 feet where a greater diameter of the breakwater cells would be required? The former figure, the Engineers indicate, would be $2,496.50; the latter, $2,594.50 per foot.

ENGINEER REPLY

In computing the ratio of benefits to costs, Col. J. A. Smedile, district head of the Engineers, considers only Federal costs because he deems to be self-liquidating the State's share and the $4.5 million to be invested by steel interests.

The Save the Dunes Council contends there are two items which are not self-liquidating and, therefore, should have been considered in determining the benefit-to-cost ratio. These are:

1. The United States says the State must be responsible for repairing the 27,000 cubic yards of shore erosion expected to result each year from construction of the harbor.

2. The Engineers say that the State must reimburse the Federal Government for any outer harbor dredging costs in excess of $3.7 million.

[From the Chicago's American, Feb. 22, 1963]

CHARGE DUNES DATA FAKED

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

(NOTE.—As Congress waits action by the Budget Bureau on an inland port for Indiana expected to cost taxpayers more than $25 million in Federal funds if approved, Chicago's American publishes this analysis on the mysterious actions of the Army Corps of Engineers and its reports on the Burns Ditch project. Herewith is the second article in this special report.)

The Great Lakes Towing Co. has told Chicago's American that the Army Corps of Engineers never studied the records upon which it bases certain favorable recommendations for a harbor at Burns Ditch in Indiana.

The corps states that its figures were derived from a "study of actual transit and detention time, 1959 records."

Capt. Donald McGarity, vice president of the towing company's western division, which handles all tug services in the Calumet River, said Army Engineers never requested this information.

And this company is the only source of complete data.

CHECK ON FIGURES

Since Congress is being asked to vote for spending $25.5 million of taxpayers' money for a harbor to chiefly benefit Bethlehem and Midwest Steel Cos., it first should determine if the Army Engineers' figures pass muster.

The Corps says shippers of coal, grain, and general cargo could save $610,000 a year through operating out of Burns Ditch, were a public port to be built there, rather than the Calumet River and harbor.

The Engineers reason that an open port on the lake would save shippers time and money in avoiding the complications of river transit, including the raising of drawbridges, towing costs, and vessel delays.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who is fighting to save Indiana's remaining dunelands, agrees that this approach is valid, but he charges the corps ballooned its estimates for the purpose of showing economic justification for Federal participation in the harbor project.

COMPLETE STUDY

Since no analysis ever has been published, and the public does not have access to the records, Chicago's American has made a complete study of the corps' 1960 report, which was ordered suppressed, and its 1962 report, which now is being reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget.

A comparison of these and other documents released by Col. J. A. Smedile, head of the Chicago district, Army Engineers, shows a perplexing tangle of jacked-up figures, all of which tend to justify the Burns Ditch plan.

ARMY ESTIMATES LOADS IN FUTURE

In a report on the Calumet Harbor and River issued in December 1961, the corps estimated that over the next 50 years the average load for vessels would be 16,400 tons for coal, 16,600 for grain, and 4,000 for general cargo.

One month later, in a Burns Ditch report, the corps estimated these same loads at $12,-500, 9,400, and 3,000, respectively.

Obviously, these discrepancies tend to increase appreciably the number of vessel trips necessary to handle the anticipated traffic.

In 1962 Burns Ditch report doubles the 1960 estimates of vessel delays; it raises the projected average tug cost for coal traffic from $305 to $780, and it hikes the average vessel operation cost per hour for grain traffic from $134 to $191.

Senator DOUGLAS has asked the Bureau of the Budget to press its inquiry into these revisions.

SOME PREDICTIONS BY THE EXPERTS

In view of the fact that the Engineers are dealing with a 50-year projection, and purportedly basing their conclusions on a 1985 estimated average, Chicago's American took a look into the future.

Ken Moreland, of the American Bureau of Shipping, said it is possible there will be no tug movements at all in 25 years, since the Great Lakes fleet by then might be so maneuverable as to not require this service.

Frank Nugent, president of the Freeman Coal Mining Corp., says that within a few years the majority of the ships probably will have bow power thrust (a forward propeller), which would reduce tugs from two into the river and one out to one in and none out—a cut of two-thirds.

E. B. Williams, vice president of American Shipbuilding Co., has prepared a crystal-ball forecast in which he foresees redesigning of the entire ore fleet to eliminate tug usage.

PLAN SWITCHOVER IN 4 YEARS

Howard H. Scott, vice president of the Bird-Johnson Co. of South Walpole, Mass., manufacturer of marine propellers, says "we are rather hopeful that all self-unloading vessels will be equipped with bow thrusters within the next 4 years."

It is reported that all Ford Motor Co. ships soon will be converted to forward propellers, which will allow them to turn under their own power, and Captain McGarity says independent operators will have to change over "to stay in the picture."

The J. R. Sensibar, a coal carrier operated by the Columbia Transportation Co. of Cleveland, is a bow thruster which made 131 trips in the Calumet River from April through September of last year.

This is approximately one-third of the total coal vessel trips made. The Sensibar needed only one tug escort into the river and none on the way out, and its average delay was less than 1 hour.

JUST WHAT DO ENGINEERS MEAN?

So the question is, Where do the Army Engineers get their projection?

In sharpshooting the engineers' 1962 report, one might start at the very beginning—the opening sentence of the syllabus, which reads:

"The district engineer concludes that the proposed Burns waterway harbor is economically justified by anticipated transportation savings on transshipments of grain, coal, and oversea general cargo, and on receipts of iron ore, limestone, and coal for the Midwest Steel Corp."

What receipts of iron ore, limestone, and coal? The report doesn't indicate. Nor is there mention of savings to steel interests if taxpayers should finance a port for them.

It is true that in 1960 the corps based its favorable recommendation on the benefits Midwest would realize if it did not have to ship its incoming supplies by rail from the Calumet or Indiana harbors to its Burns ditch mill.

But this was based on two false presumptions: First, that Midwest in the immediate future would set up an integrated steel plant, to which it still is not committed; second, that there was no alternative but for the company to transship supplies.

Presumption No. 2 was exploded by Midwest's statement at a public hearing in Indianapolis August 30, 1961, that it would construct its own private port at Burns Ditch if the Federal Government didn't come through with a subsidy.

The corps then had to start from scratch and seek an entirely different approach to economic justification for Federal participation.

Thus in 1962 the pitch was that steel interests (including Bethlehem) would benefit by $940,000 a year if they didn't have to build their own harbor.

QUESTION RAISED ON TRANSSHIPPING

In either event, whether the project were public or private, iron ore, limestone, and metallurgical coal would be shipped directly to the docks at Burns Ditch. There would be no transshipment involved.

So what is Colonel Smedile trying to say in his syllabus?

Senator DOUGLAS comments: "Either the Corps of Engineers is confused or they are attempting to confuse the public."

Earlier this month, Chicago's American detailed at length the tremendous political pressure and the motives behind the Burns Ditch project.

But one thing that has not been told is that Indiana taxpayers had absolutely nothing to say about selection of the site and that Indiana politicians dictated the choice to the Corps of Army Engineers.

In Indianapolis on May 3, 1961, a public hearing was conducted by the Indiana Port Commission for the announced purpose of determining the desired location for a deepwater harbor along the Lake Michigan shoreline.

What all of the John Q. Publics and their wives who attended the session did not know was that the Burns Ditch deal already had been signed, sealed, and delivered.

As far back as January 22, 1960, the Indiana Board of Public Harbors and Terminals, the Indiana Department of Conservation and Midwest Steel had entered into a secret agreement to place the port adjacent to the steel company's 750 acres of property at Burns Ditch in Porter County.

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 23, 1963]

DUNES HARBOR: WHO PAYS, WHO PROFITS?

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

Do you owe any money to Bethlehem Steel Co. or to the Midwest Division of the National Steel Corp.?

Don't be too sure. Taxpayers from Hawaii to Maine and from Alaska to Florida soon may be told to pick up a tab of $25.5 million for a deepwater harbor at Burns Waterway in Indiana.

And if you live in the Hoosier State, you face an additional bite of $38 million—courtesy of Gov. Matthew E. Welsh.

For what? To give the steel companies a readymade port, private slips, terminal facilities, the whole works.

Indiana officials are attempting to convince Congress that they can guarantee repayment of a proposed revenue bond issue to finance the State's promised contribution to the project.

Clinton Green, Governor Welsh's administrative assistant who doubles as Port Commission secretary, testified before a Senate subcommittee:

"You see, we have an organization, for instance, that transfers coal from rail cars to ships. They want to come in and locate."

Green was referring to the Rail to Water Transfer Corp., which operates at cost from its docks on the Calumet River in Illinois.

The Army Corps of Engineers has built its castle in the sand around the theory that Rail to Water will move all of its operations to Burns Ditch. But will it?

Leo M. Geissal, president of the corporation, told the Chicago American that he never has gone beyond the original letter of intent, which stated that the facilities might be switched over if there were economic benefits to its customers.

One of the principal movers of coal that is alined with Rail to Water is the Freeman Coal Mining Corp. Its president, Frank Nugent, and Geissal are extremely disturbed over the rate of 53.7 cents that the Belt railway of Chicago charges per ton for hauling coal 1¼ miles from the Illinois Central yards to the Calumet River transfer point.

They would move in a minute if it were economically feasible. But how can they beat their present rate of 18.5 cents per ton for the transfer from rail cars to ship by moving to Burns Ditch, where their rentals would be the chief hope of Indiana's amortizing its bonds?

CAN'T SEE PROFIT IN DUNES MOVE

Rail to water is hooked on the horns of a dilemma, but neither Geissal nor Nugent believes it will be profitable to move.

This newspaper checked a persistent rumor that a large Chicago brokerage house had expressed interest in underwriting the proposed Indiana bond issue. A partner in the firm said that preliminary examination indicated it might be a sound proposition. He added.

"Why shouldn't it be if it is backed by these two large steel companies?"

This possibility was explored adversely in testimony before the Senate public lands subcommittee:

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico—"Do they [Bethlehem and Midwest Steel companies] guarantee in any way the repayment of these revenue bonds?"

Green. "No sir."

NO GUARANTEE ON BONDS CERTAIN

ANDERSON pursued by asking: "There will be at some stage a financial guarantee by Bethlehem and by Midwest?"

Green. "I am not so sure of that, because there will be a financial guarantee by these other users."

Green introduced "letters of intent" from eight companies, whereupon Senator ANDERSON remarked that there is a considerable difference between a letter of intent and a firm commitment.

One of Green's letters was from Rail to Water.

The second was from American Oil Co. [of Indiana], which is enthusiastic and seeks an exclusive franchise to sell all petroleum products to users of the port area.

N.Y.C. INTERESTED IN COAL DOCKS

The third is from the New York Central Railroad, which requests first refusal rights [or an option] to coal docks, warehouses, and other concessions.

The others are innocuous, neither saying "yes" nor "no" to anything.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, a bitter opponent of a plan he says will mean using taxpayers' money to wreck the dunes for the convenience of two big steel companies, claims that these letters are window dressing and do not represent one nickel of guaranteed investment.

Nevertheless, the harbor project is being backed to the hilt by nearly all Indiana politicians and by the Army engineers, who in a 1960 report conceded that 97.3 percent of all benefits would accrue to the steel interests.

SUGGEST A SITE IN LAKE COUNTY

This subsidy is opposed by the Save the Dunes Council, a group of 2,400 conservationists; by Senator DOUGLAS, who gave the dissenters a voice in Washington, and by many scientists.

They say they want to see Indiana get a deepwater public harbor, but they insist it should be located where it would spare the dunelands and yet be of maximum economic value to the State. They suggest a site in Lake County, which would connect the Calumet and Indiana Harbors.

It would be politically naive to ask why the steel companies don't end the rumpus by building their own private harbor, since they have expressed a willingness to do so in the absence of Federal aid.

The point is, say critics of the plan, that Governor Welsh has bet all of his chips on this one deal. In one form or another, he has to deliver a public harbor or be dead politically, since, in Indiana, a governor cannot succeed himself.

An interesting sidelight is that eight owners of industrial property fronting on the lake near Whiting sponsored a port feasibility study of the Whiting-Hammond-East Chicago area.

The New York City firm of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Hall, & MacDonald [now Parson, Brinkerhoff, Quade, & Douglas], of which Morris N. Quade is consulting engineer, was retained to do the work.

The riparian property holders entered into an agreement that only a preliminary survey would be undertaken unless there was unanimous consent to go deeper.

STUDY DUMPED BEFORE REPORT

This condition doomed the project to failure. Two months before the preliminary report was submitted in February 1958, the New York Central was dickering for an option at Burns Ditch and American Oil was worrying about how much it would cost to extend its refinery's water intake and outlet pipes several miles farther out into the lake to reach beyond the proposed harbor.

The engineering consulting firm was told to bow out of the picture.

Quade, however, didn't think his work should go unnoticed. He accepted an invitation to address the Hammond Chamber of Commerce. He then detailed his reasons for deciding that the Tri-City area in Lake County, Ind., would be ideal, meeting all six of his criteria for a deepwater port.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 874 NECESSARY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a situation which, I feel, calls for early action. Across the Nation, at this season of the year, thousands of

school boards and superintendents are wrestling with the problems of estimating budgets, hiring teachers, and planning curricula for the next academic year. As a former educator, I know how difficult these problems can be and how thoroughly they can affect an entire community.

This year, however, some 4,000 school districts face additional uncertainty because of the expiration of certain portions of the federally affected area laws on June 30, 1963. These districts enroll one-third of all public elementary and secondary school pupils in the Nation. The Federal payments to eligible school districts under Public Law 874 during the 1962 fiscal year amounted to 5.2 percent of the total current operating expense budgets of these districts, and in some cases to much more. Many school districts face a serious crisis if they cannot know until June or later whether they have the money to support decisions that must be made in March.

In my State of South Dakota, many educators are troubled and anxious about the future of this legislation. They fear that the attachment of this legislation to an omnibus education bill will mean months of delay and make impossible an early decision on extending Public Laws 874 and 815. They remember the battle of 2 years ago, when they were unable until late summer to hire teachers and buy needed textbooks and teaching supplies. They are most anxious that this rather noncontroversial legislation not become embroiled in the controversy over comprehensive Federal aid to education.

The extension of this legislation is vital to educational planning in my State. In the 71 school districts in South Dakota receiving payments under Public Law 874, a fifth of their operating budgets comes from this source. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the net entitlement and current expenditures of the 71 school districts in South Dakota receiving aid under this law be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

South Dakota

Total	$2,425,471	$12,267,467
2 Flandreau Independent School District No. 3	16,740	243,300
3 Hot Springs Independent School District	62,476	316,730
4 Piedmont Independent School District No. 34	6,115	46,500
7 Rapid City Independent School District No. 1	683,357	3,833,920
8 Ravinia and Plain Center Independent School District No. 98, Ravinia		
9 Sturgis Independent School District No. 12	92,368	440,753
10 Lake Andes Independent School District	6,725	115,000
14 Todd County Independent School District, Mission	199,834	473,650
201 Pickstown Independent School District No. 96	51,648	68,000
202 Chamberlin Independent School District	36,170	247,000
204 Douglas School District No. 3, Ellsworth Air Force Base	387,665	558,284
205 Newell Independent School District No. 7	8,668	142,800
206 Black Hawk School District No. 45	2,989	11,723
402 Sisseton Independent School District No. 1	15,245	345,875
403 Custer Independent School District	13,199	217,000
404 New Underwood Independent School District No. 23	$14,797	$825,000
405 Whitewood Consolidated School District No. 66	8,967	40,000
406 Wagner Independent School District No. 99	5,978	170,975
407 Rapid Valley Consolidated School District No. 4 Rapid City	14,946	80,000
502 Hill City Independent School District	4,323	96,170
503 Cleghorn Consolidated School District No. 85, Rapid City	5,978	50,000
504 Shannon County Consolidated School District, Pine Ridge	156,340	237,000
701 Dupree Independent School District No. 12	5,081	70,000
703 Blunt Independent School District No. 2	4,035	50,000
704 Harrold Independent School District No. 3	1,943	63,213
705 Big Bend School District No. 32, Rapid City	1,943	7,000
706 Washabaugh Unorganized Consolidated School District, Wanblee	14,788	70,000
708 Eagle Butte Independent School District No. 3	52,910	135,500
801 Rosebud Consolidated School District No. 24	1,793	7,048
802 Gettysburg Independent School District No. 1	15,544	184,884
803 Eastern School District No. 15, Dupree	1,644	9,000
805 Fairview School District No. 3, Dupree	2,481	13,050
807 Interior Independent School District No. 55	3,801	44,506
808 Bennett County I.H. School District, Martin	5,762	100,000
809 White River Independent School District	27,053	85,500
810 Martin Consolidated School District No. 2	11,931	130,000
811 Timber Lake Independent School District No. 2	4,633	138,000
813 Wood Independent School District No. 1	2,391	48,167
814 McLaughlin Independent School District No. 3	28,398	15,000
902 Mobridge Independent School District No. 13	7,473	436,083
903 Nemo Consolidated School District No. 55	2,839	8,970
904 McIntosh Independent School District No. 1	28,547	203,450
1001 Wahehe School District No. 83, Greenwood	19,196	19,469
1002 Smee Independent School District No. 4, Wakpala	34,825	121,175
1003 Boulder Park Consolidated School District No. 14, Deadwood	3,288	11,510
1005 St. Charles Consolidated School District No. 104	8,370	27,000
1006 Elvira Township Independent School District No. 4, Gann Valley	9,117	67,286
1008 Blackpipe Consolidated School District No. 8, Norris	12,256	34,427
1009 North River School District No. 16, Dupree	5,530	33,000
1102 Provo Independent School District No. 36, Igloo	177,722	224,584
1103 Washington Consolidated School District No. 26, Norris	2,690	4,292
1104 Edgemont Independent School District No. 37	19,579	158,983
1201 Victory School District No. 8, Fort Thompson	12,080	23,500
1202 Wall Independent School District No. 58	13,969	80,386
1203 Wasta School District No. 1	4,179	16,950
1204 Keystone Consolidated School District No. 2	5,429	20,000
1205 Martin Consolidated School District No. 3	7,253	38,000
1206 Evergreen Consolidated School District No. 17	5,978	55,000
1207 Pukwana Independent School District No. 1	3,288	15,000
1208 Duncon Consolidated School District No. 2, Keldron	4,483	25,000
1210 Sisseton Consolidated School District No. 4	5,081	84,012
1301 Buffalo Gap Independent School District No. 4	2,690	37,000
1302 Philip Independent School District	5,978	135,114
1303 Spearfish Independent School District No. 4	8,071	268,228
1304 Oral School District No. 34	3,288	23,500
1305 Belle Fourche Independent School District No. 26		
1306 Highmore Independent School District No. 1	22,347	120,000
1307 Oacoma Consolidated School District No. 2	4,185	18,000
1308 White Eagle School District No. 18, Rapid City	$2,690	$15,000
1309 Cherry Creek School District No. 2, Dupree	2,391	12,000
1310 Faith Independent School District No. 8		

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to call special attention to the situation that exists in Rapid City, S. Dak., as a result of the uncertainty about this legislation. Mr. Paul C. Stevens, superintendent of the Rapid City public schools, informs me that he is anticipating an increase in enrollment of 800 pupils in the Rapid City school system next fall. This means the hiring of 25 more teachers, the provision of more classrooms, and the purchase of many additional books and supplies. Already the school budget requires a levy of 39.76 mills—the State limitation is 40 mills—and the half-million dollars being received under Public Law 874 accounts for 11 percent of the total budget. About 3,000, or 24 percent, of the 12,500 pupils enrolled in the Rapid City schools are classified as federally connected. Because of the rapid pace in construction of the Minuteman missile projects in the area, this proportion is rising.

And yet Mr. Stevens, like other superintendents across the State, cannot compete for high quality teachers or make commitments for needed supplies, until the fate of this legislation is known. Already I have received urgent letters from superintendents and citizens in Hot Springs, Igloo, Pierre, and other cities expressing their concern. I expect to receive many more.

Why is it, Mr. President, that many of our Nation's educators and school boards already harrassed by mounting problems of school administration, must be subjected to this additional uncertainty? Is it because there is any doubt about the intentions of Congress about this vital legislation? On the contrary, no laws affecting education have received more consistent support than Public Laws 815 and 874. Is it because the President has not recommended the continuation of this legislation? No, in his admirable message on education to the Congress, the President recommended a 4-year continuation of the portions of these laws which expire on June 30, 1963.

What, then, is the problem? Why are our educators and school boards being denied swift action on their plea for continuation of Public Laws 815 and 874? The answer lies in the political deadlock in the Congress which has hamstrung action on comprehensive legislation for many years. The opponents of Federal aid to education are, above all, political realists who recognize the universal popularity of the impacted areas legislation. They will vote for these measures because they know that thousands of educators and parents in their home States are immediately concerned about them. The President, too, is a political realist. He knows that these programs are proven and popular and wishes to make their extension part of a vitally needed comprehensive program of national help to schools. He is right

when he says that "the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special programs."

But should these schools which desperately need some early decision on this legislation bear the entire burden of our indecisiveness in national policy toward education? May I make a suggestion, Mr. President, that may perhaps be helpful in satisfying the educators' concern and yet preserve the lines in the legislative struggle over this matter?

Can we not agree to a 1-year extension of the present provisions of these laws, without change, and leave the question of the longer extension requested by the President for resolution in the give-and-take of debate on S. 580? Would not this satisfy both parties to the legislative struggle over the future aid to education? Above all, it would enable thousands of educators and school boards to make their decisions now on faculty, classrooms, and supplies in the fall. This seems to me a sensible and practical way out of the biennial pressure to which we subject the teachers and administrators of schools responsible for educating several million American youngsters.

I would welcome an expression of the thinking of my colleagues in the Senate on this important matter. If education, as the President so well put it, is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress, then it is certainly our duty in the Congress to assist rather than hamper those who are building the arch.

TAX CONSIDERATION FOR THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, 1 week ago today my senior colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I introduced S. 824 for the relief of one of America's most hard pressed industries—the gold-mining industry. I want to call attention to the fact that assistance for this industry is in no sense a partisan matter. In South Dakota informed people are deeply concerned about the future of mining. Most of the commercial gold mining still being done in the United States is conducted in the Black Hills of South Dakota, and the Homestake Gold Mine, once known as the world's largest gold mine, is located at Lead, S. Dak. Yet, this large mine is facing a difficult struggle to remain operative in the face of mounting obstacles.

It is truly ironic that in a time when the Nation is confronted with a rapidly diminishing reserve of gold, some of the most highly productive gold mines within our country have been closed. In actual fact, more than 95 percent of the gold mines in the United States have been forced to close in recent years. As the Senator from South Dakota put it:

> 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.

While gold production in the United States continues to decline, the world production of gold rose in 1962 for the ninth successive year establishing a new high estimated at 49.5 million ounces. Since the need for gold is clearly urgent, I submit that it is imperative we do something to stimulate gold mining in the United States. Of all the means readily at hand, I feel that an increase in the gold depletion allowance, as provided in the bill introduced by the two Senators from South Dakota, is the most feasible and would have the most immediate effect.

OVERALL MILITARY POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last Friday at the military posture hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I asked Secretary of Defense McNamara the question, "What is the U.S. policy on Cuba?" It does not violate security to reveal what his answer was, since on that day the chairman of the committee did reveal his answer, which was that there were two objectives in the policy on Cuba: First, overthrow Castro and eliminate Communist control of Cuba; and second, prevent export of aggression by force from Cuba into other parts of the hemisphere.

I asked the Secretary of Defense other questions, which I request be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH TO DEFENSE SECRETARY MCNAMARA, AT THE 1963 DEFENSE POSTURE HEARINGS, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE

OVERALL IMPRESSION

1. President Kennedy and General Taylor have said there would be no winners in a nuclear war. You and the President have stressed the growing power of Russia's nuclear forces. Under Secretary Gilpatric has publicly stated that he doesn't know how war can be limited "once you start using any kind of a nuclear bang."

It is reasonable to conclude that the overall impression created by these statements is that the United States is afraid to use nuclear weapons for fear doing so would immediately and automatically escalate to a holocaust war. That's the impression I get—and I think it is probable that it is the impression Khrushchev gets.

Yet, the world knows that the Communists have a vast superiority in combat forces for conventional warfare, including first-rate armored units and the largest tactical air force in the world. Coupled with this they have interior lines of supply and communication—an aggressive attitude to conquer the world—and some pretty weak opponents on their borders, like Iran, Burma, India, Thailand.

If, in view of these facts, Khrushchev decides to challenge the United States and Allied conventional forces on a broad scale, what do you propose to do about it?

2. Is your long term objective to create large enough conventional forces in the free world to cope with major Communist aggressions without resort to nuclear weapons?

3. Or are we really much bolder about nuclear weapons than our public statements would indicate?

4. If so, are we programing sufficient tactical nuclear capabilities to win such a conflict without carrying it to the point of an ICBM exchange?

INFORMATION PROGRAM

1. We have read a great deal about the managed news policy and operation of the Department of Defense. Would you please explain that policy, the reasons for it, and how it works?

2. Is it not a fact that there is a policy, regulation or firm practice in the Department of Defense that news information, particularly notices to Members of Congress, has to be cleared through the Department of Defense by each of the services?

3. What does that clearance consist of? Does it include approval as to the timing of such notices to Members of Congress?

4. I have been told by reliable sources inside the Pentagon that there is a requirement that no notice shall go to Members of Congress by the services until at least 48 hours after such notice has been given to the Department of Defense—is this true? What is the exact situation?

5. I have been told by the same reliable sources that at least 48-hour advance notice must be given to the White House—is this true? What is the exact situation?

6. Although I am a member of this committee—and a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense—both in 1961 and in 1962 I have had the experiences of information being given on Maine military construction contracts to the junior Senator by the White House and withheld from me. In 1962 on one occasion through a committee staff member I requested information from the Navy Department on a submarine award 2 days prior to the time it was given to the junior Senator from Maine by the White House and the Navy Department refused to provide the information—again within a few minutes after the junior Senator from Maine announced the award and it had appeared on the wire service teletype a request was made on my behalf and again the Navy Department refused to give me the information that the White House had given the junior Senator and which had been announced by the junior Senator—in fact, the Navy Department refused to give me that information until about 3 hours later.

With this having happened annually in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration—in 1961 and 1962—will this pattern be repeated in this third year of the Kennedy administration, in 1963?

7. For your information, the so-called split-second current timing by Army, Navy, and Air Force officers on notices to members of congressional delegations—when favored Democratic Senators and Congressmen have been given the information by the White House at least hours ahead if not days ahead—has cast them in the degrading role of Gilbert and Sullivan, comic-opera-like military officers and made such scenes as their synchronizing their watches in order to appear in, or contact, each individual office at the same split second, so ludicrous that it has become a topic of ridicule and they have become a laughing stock in such operations—almost like Keystone Cops.

Do you approve of casting them in such degrading messenger boy roles delivering messages that have already been delivered hours or days before by the White House to the favored few Democratic Senators and Democratic Congressmen and even already announced by the favored Senators?

8. Do you think that this is a practice that any administration should tolerate?

9. Do you plan to do anything about it?

10. There was a rare time when I learned in advance—not from the White House, not

from your legislative affairs office, and not from the Army Legislative Liaison Office—that an Army award had been given to a Maine concern. I made the announcement first. Subsequent to that, I was informed by some persons that two investigations had been made to attempt to determine how I got that information—one investigation conducted by the Army Inspector General, another investigation by Army Intelligence—and that persons had been interrogated as to whether they had given the information to me

Apparently it was all right for the White House to give the information to the junior Senator and the Navy deny such information to me even though I asked for it both before and after the White House had given it to the junior Senator—but when I got the information ahead of the junior Senator, such was apparently a crime—enough to prompt what was reported a reaction that was not satisfied with only one investigation on my getting the information but required two investigations.

I would appreciate your supplying me with such information as you can on these investigations.

11. Mr. Secretary, recently on a telecast interview I was asked if I felt that I was getting the information that I should from this administration. My answer was "No" and I referred specifically to my work as a member of this committee and the Appropriations Committee.

I had in mind a very specific example—the request that I made for a percentage breakdown of the planned defense budget for fiscal year 1965 according to the categories of (a) offensive capability weapons, (b) general purpose capability weapons, (c) defensive capability weapons, and (d) research and development. I call your attention to pages 43 and 44 of the printed record of January 19, 1962. While you agreed at that time to furnish information later in response to my question, what followed thereafter was initial great resistance by the Department of Defense, particularly the office of Under Secretary Gilpatric, to provide the information which I requested.

When I confronted Mr. Gilpatric's office with the fact that not only had the information I had requested—but even more—been given to the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron on the Tuesday following your Friday appearance before the committee when I asked for the information, Mr. Gilpatric's office denied that such was the case. In fact, he formalized his denial in a letter dated February 15, 1962, to me and which you will find on pages 43 and 44 of the hearing record. I call your attention to his letter of denial and my reply.

I then called for the visual chart that had been shown to the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron; and when I did Mr. Gilpatric came to my office and brought the chart with him, admitted that his denial was incorrect, that what I had asked for and had previously been denied as a member of this committee, had actually been given to a large group of Reserve officers, most of whom had no connection with this committee and whose rank was as junior as that of lieutenant.

This is what I mean by being denied information as a member of this committee. Will it continue to be necessary for me to attend the meeting of BARRY GOLDWATER'S 9999th Air Reserve Squadron in order to receive information that is deliberately withheld from this committee as it was in this instance up to the very end when I confronted your office with identification of the very visual chart displayed to that group?

FEARLESS NEWSMAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all in the Congress—indeed all in our Government and all in our excellent press corps who knew the late Robert W. Richards—deeply mourn his sudden passing.

Bob Richards was the chief of the Washington bureau of the Copley Newspapers. Many excellent Copley publications are located in the State from which I come. I was proud to call Bob Richards a friend; so was my wife. He was highly respected by his colleagues in our free press, and also by all in the Congress who knew him. All of us will miss him greatly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the San Diego Union for February 13, 1963, commenting on the great loss we have suffered because of the passing of Bob Richards.

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

FEARLESS NEWSMAN

The death of Robert W. Richards, chief of the Copley Newspapers Washington bureau, comes as a personal shock to his newspaper and political friends across the Nation.

More importantly, the untimely death silences a man who spoke fearlessly of government regardless of how high the criticism might reach.

Mr. Richards covered an era of almost continual crisis for this country and the world. In his 20 years as a war correspondent and Washington reporter, he won the respect and friendship of top military and political leaders.

Mr. Richards was of the old school of newsmen who covered every phase of government from local through national. His outspoken opinions were respected by White House advisers, Congressmen, military and naval leaders and countless thousands of American newspaper readers.

His wit was a source of pleasure to friends and associates on the Washington scene and wherever he traveled.

Copley Newspaper readers will greatly miss the informative reporting under the byline of Robert W. Richards, a reporter who literally exhausted himself covering the world to bring them facts.

A CURE FOR SICK CITIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a recent article entitled "A Cure for Sick Cities," which appeared in the February 9, 1963, issue of Saturday Review, our distinguished colleague, Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, perceptively and skillfully presented several suggestions which, if adopted, might indeed bring realism to the coordination of the Federal programs which are designed to better the lives of those who dwell in our great urban and suburban areas.

As a Senator from a burgeoning metropolitan State and with a long and deep interest in urban problems, Senator CASE's comments should be of particular interest to all who want to bring efficiency and economy to these programs.

There seems to be some question as to the administration's desire to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Senator CASE notes the reasons why the administration's reorganization plan failed in the last Congress. The administration might well want to adopt the Senator's suggestions in any new proposal. The Federal interest in urban affairs includes more than housing; it includes also mass transportation, air pollution, highways, and water pollution to name but a few areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include Senator CASE's article, "A Cure for Sick Cities," at this point in the RECORD.

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

A CURE FOR SICK CITIES

(By U.S. Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey)

The years since 1950 in America have brought the revolution of urbanization, as it has been rightly called. About 125 million people and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. In the decade ending in 1960, 84 percent of our total population growth was in these areas. In the next quarter century our urban population is expected to increase by another 100 million people.

William Wheaton, of the University of Pennsylvania, recently told the Conference on Urban Life that we will be required to duplicate the size and capacity of all American cities existing in 1940 in order to accommodate our population growth in the next 20 years. To do this will involve an estimated investment of more than $1,000 billion.

With this growth, the problems of urban life confronting us today—in education, employment, housing, recreation, discriminatory practices, open spaces, sewage disposal, urban sprawl, health services, transportation, crime prevention, water and air pollution, slum clearance, and taxation—will become enormously more difficult. The States and local communities have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems. Yet the State and local governments can no longer do the job alone, both because of its increasing magnitude and because many of the problems cross local and even State boundaries.

Each level of government must share the responsibility for seeing to it that we meet the problems of this revolution of urbanization, of technology, of population migration, and of social mobility and fluidity. And there is no escaping the fact that the role of the Federal Government has assumed increasing importance in the affairs of metropolitan areas.

This was recognized by the Kennedy administration in its proposal to the past Congress that a new Cabinet position be created—a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Congress failed to approve this plan for two basic reasons, I think:

1. Congress is governed by a loose affiliation of rural-living, rural-oriented, and rural-voting Members of Congress of both parties. That this is the real focus of congressional power has been apparent for years. In the hinterlands, it is still politically popular for the country cousin to flail the city slicker. For the country man, these political scalps on his belt continue to be prime assets at the polls. The importance of this fact of congressional life has rarely been more clearly demonstrated than in the defeat of the administration's reorganization plan this year.

2. The reorganization plan itself was inadequate. Its greatest weakness was its failure to bring all the Federal programs affecting urban development under one administrative roof. All the administration plan proposed was to elevate the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet level. Yet the jurisdiction of the HHFA by no means covers the range of problems confronting urban and suburban communities.

Because of this the administration was unable to muster the full political support of even those members of Congress who

come from our urban and suburban areas. Its plan failed to meet what should be one of the basic objectives of this new department, namely the elimination of waste and duplication through the coordination of the currently fragmented Federal programs affecting our metropolitan areas.

I believe that the President should now seek to determine which of the activities of the Federal Government need to be brought under the jurisdiction of a new Department of Urban Affairs. With this objective in mind, Mr. Kennedy could appoint an advisory commission from within and without Government to study this matter and make recommendations to the President and to Congress as to how best to strengthen the existing—and once-defeated—reorganization plan.

There is no doubt, I believe, of the need for such a new Cabinet post. The report of the Senate Government Operations Committee, in approving the proposed reorganization plan in 1961, said that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would assist States and localities emerging from the transformation of the American scene from a predominantly rural society to a vast urban complex. This transformation is moving at an accelerated pace.

Our cities have been caught between two population surges—rural people pressing in on the older cities for jobs, for better educational opportunities, for conveniences, while city residents are moving to the suburbs. Under these pressures, the process of city deterioration sets in. Taxes rise to meet the resulting increased cost of police and fire protection and of other municipal services. As city people, many of them from the relatively prosperous middle class, move to the suburbs, they leave the central city weaker in tax revenue and in many other ways. Further decay of the city core follows.

And, in many areas of the country, our problems go beyond urban overcrowding, beyond slums and downtown decay, beyond the slowdown in transportation, beyond the problems of depressed business and commercial sections, beyond strangling traffic in downtown areas.

Our problems extend far into suburbia itself. They cross city lines. We face the cancer of unplanned and uncontrolled suburban growth. The older suburbs are threatened with the same fate as the downtown cities. Those who move to the suburbs seeking better living and some tax relief must, once again, provide those services, particularly schools, already established in the cities they have left. Our transportation planners confront incredibly difficult problems of moving suburban residents into and out of the cities where they work, handicapped by a transportation system weighted heavily on the side of highway facilities as compared with rail and rapid transit.

Civic, labor, and business groups have joined in many of our cities in a comprehensive effort to reverse this trend. For these groups, it is a matter of good business, of stabilizing downtown property values, and of creating more jobs and better housing. It is a matter of eliminating slums and replacing blight with new buildings and new tax ratables which can eventually lead to real estate tax reduction. But it is more than that—it is a matter of local pride as well.

To further this new civic resolve, the Federal Government has lent a hand. At the urging of both Republican and Democratic administrations, earlier Federal aid, notably mortgage insurance for homeowners, has been expanded over a period of years to include such new programs as urban renewal, loans for home improvements, for public facilities, for public works planning, for housing for the elderly and for college students, and a wide range of other activities.

The Federal Government has recognized that this is not just a problem of the central city. It has properly sought to encourage the solution of urban problems through State and local action, including area-wide regional and interstate cooperation. For example, it provides grants to assist regional and metropolitan efforts toward comprehensive planning.

These programs are under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But under other agencies, there are activities equally important to urban areas. Under the proposed Reorganization Plan, these would not be brought under the new department. For example, highway planners find their concern is often exclusively with traffic needs while local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones. The clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing and Home Finance Agency—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

There are problems, too, in the urban scheme of things, with regard to the relative place of highways and rapid transit plans. Recently, the White House released a technical report prepared by a group of experts which suggested, in part, that more express buses, operating in reserved traffic lanes, might be mass transit's answer to the growing problem of traffic jams that threaten to strangle our metropolitan areas. Conceivably, legislation proposed by the administration to assist and supplement mass transportation facilities, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, would result in a significant increase in express buses on our highways. The Federal Government would contribute financially to this end. But regardless of the ultimate fate of the administration's mass transit program, a modest program of mass transportation assistance, already on the books, would also lead to greater utilization of express buses. This program is administered today by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

There is clearly no objection to locating mass transit programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But a significant increase in the number of buses on the streets would quite obviously affect what another agency of Government is trying to do to combat air pollution. And this is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Today these activities of the Federal Government are unrelated. Nor would they be related under the proposal as submitted by the President to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Beyond this, duplication and waste would inevitably follow if mass transit plans are centered in the new department while another Federal agency—the Department of Commerce—continues to guide, finance, and control the construction of urban and suburban roads.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions or the most efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar in meeting overall community needs.

Here is where a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing could work to the greatest advantage. It could coordinate Federal programs which have as their purpose the promotion of orderly community planning and growth.

The reorganization plan, as first submitted, can be a start but will not fully meet this purpose. For, as I have stated, it does not now provide for bringing all the Federal programs affecting urban development under one administrative roof.

If the planning problems and fiscal needs of urban centers and of suburbia, too, can be reviewed by one agency, it will not be at the cost of local and State home rule. Rather, I believe, local governments will be stimulated to develop their own comprehensive plans for the solution of areawide problems if we center already available Federal assistance and existing Federal functions in a single agency.

We need to come up with a better plan than the one proposed by the Kennedy administration. It would be my hope that renewed consideration of its deficiencies might lead not only to a better plan, but to one that would draw for the first time the sympathetic support, including political support, of the increasingly important suburbs. One minor improvement that comes readily to mind might be in the name of the new agency itself—why not call it the Department of Urban and Suburban Affairs? But details aside, if we are to have a delay in reconsideration of the need for a new department, we should make maximum use of the time available to us by strengthening the Reorganization Plan.

I do not suggest that all the administrative problems of Federal assistance to metropolitan areas will be solved simply by reallocating functions and organizing a new Cabinet department.

Only by continually strengthening Federal policies and programs that seek to deal with these complexities are we likely to reach our objectives. For there are basic changes in the nature and composition of Federal assistance programs which need to be made, quite apart from the creation of the new department.

For example, I plan to introduce legislation to require the approval by the Federal Government of a unified community plan for all projects to be financied with Federal funds before funds for any single project will be allocated by the Government. In some cases, an areawide plan should be required.

This principle is already applied to urban renewal projects. Today, no city or suburb can receive Federal loans and grants to assist in clearing slums and redeveloping cleared areas without the prior approval of a so-called workable program. In general, a workable program sketches out the community's development pattern for future years. No single urban renewal project today is eligible for Federal financial assistance unless it conforms with the objectives of that community's workable program.

There is no reason why the same prohibition against wasteful spending of the taxpayer's dollar in the pursuit of inadequately planned improvements should not be extended to all Federal programs affecting cities and suburban communities.

And as we attempt to strengthen the capacity of the executive branch of the Federal Government to give more effective help in the solution of metropolitan area problems, we would be well advised to give thought to improving the way Congress itself functions in this area. Today, for example, an agreement between States on resolving problems of water or air pollution would be passed upon, not by the congressional committees which deal with health problems or with urban matters, but by the Judiciary Committee of both House and Senate, good lawyers all. And while, to take another example, programs to build better sewage treatment plants go before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee for approval, similar programs to aid in the construction of intercepting sewers leading to these treatment plants require the approval of still another committee, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

After a new Department of Urban and Suburban Affairs is established in the executive branch by Congress, we should set our own house in order by creating congressional committees on Urban and Suburban Affairs.

I cannot forecast just when these improvements will be made. Soon, I believe, the

swift-running currents of urban life will require it. The creation of a new Cabinet department can be a vital first step.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD TO BAKERSFIELD PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 22—Washington's Birthday—the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge announced its annual awards. This year the highest award in the community program category went to the Bakersfield, Calif., Principals Association, for their citizenship program which includes the kindergarten through the first eight grades.

Mr. Thomas W. Curran, past president of the Board of Education of Bakersfield City School District, and Mr. Frank Schimandle, principal of the John L. Compton Junior High School, accepted the Thomas Jefferson Medal and $500, as well as the George Washington Honor Medal. The mayor of Bakersfield appropriately declared the day to be Freedoms Day in Bakersfield. I join the many people in California and in the whole country in congratulating the board of education and the administrators, the teachers, and the students of Bakersfield who made this award possible.

SERIOUS ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 17, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] appeared with Mr. Howard K. Smith on the American Broadcasting Co. television program, "News and Comment."

In the course of the program, ABC's cameras, correspondents, and Mr. Smith did an excellent job of dramatizing some of the serious economic problems facing our Nation, particularly those in areas of so-called structural unemployment like parts of West Virginia.

May I say, Mr. President, that parts of my State of Montana are experiencing some of these same economic difficulties. I agree with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who said during the program that we are not moving vigorously enough in meeting some of our very serious economic problems.

At the end of his program, Mr. Smith came to some conclusions regarding what steps might be taken to stimulate our lagging economy and ease the plight of the 30 to 40 million people who he reports are living in abject poverty.

Mr. President, I concur with many of the opinions expressed by Mr. Smith. But whether we agree or disagree with him, I think we all would acknowledge that he has made a thoughtful contribution to the discussion of the economic problems we face in this age of rapid technological change. I wish to congratulate Mr. Smith for his thought-provoking discussion of alternatives we might consider in attacking and overcoming some of our economic ills. I also believe we should be grateful to ABC and the sponsor, Nationwide Insurance Co., for focusing the Nation's attention on these problems.

Because of the provocative nature and timeliness of Mr. Smith's February 17 program, and because some of my colleagues may have missed the opportunity of viewing it, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From "News and Comment," with Howard K. Smith, Feb. 17, 1963, ABC Television]

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE AMERICAN ECONOMY?

These films were made in Olcott, W. Va., a State where the unemployment rate is over 11 percent; where 54 percent of the children never reach high school; and where a quarter of a million people out of a total population of less than 2 million receive public assistance.

There are in America's affluent society between 30 and 40 million people who live in abject poverty.

Tonight: News and comments on the Nation's economy and the other America.

* * * * *

Mr. SMITH. Good evening. The cold war, Castro, De Gaulle have all been displaced as America's No. 1 problem. Far the greatest concern to the current session of Congress is, What is really the matter with America's economy?

The Joint Economic Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House are daily holding hearings inviting the Nation's leaders and its experts to state what they think wrong.

Though still the richest economy in the world, the American economy has for 10 years been stumbling from recession to recession. President Kennedy expressed fear of a new recession in his news conference 4 days ago. Now at a peak period, nearly 5 million Americans are unemployed. One-fifth of our magnificent industrial plant capacity is idle and useless. We are losing gold at an alarming rate to foreign countries to balance our adverse payments.

Inside America, law enforcement authorities say the slack is partly responsible for a national crime rate that is rising five times as fast as our population. It is at this moment safer to walk in wild jungles than on some of our city streets in America.

It is no exaggeration to say that if we do no better over the next generation at getting our economy moving, the United States will have a hard time remaining in the great power class.

Last year, the administration suggested that passage of the foreign trade bill would help. That was the bill to allow the President to negotiate mutually lower tariffs with other countries to stimulate trade. It is now widely acknowledged that the Foreign Trade Act will do some good—but it will in no degree improve our limping national economy.

This year the administration seeks hope in a tax bill. Taxes will be cut to give people more money to spend; and the tax structure will be reformed to give more incentives to expanding activity. This program believes that playing with taxes will not help much either, as we will argue later.

What is really wrong, and what will really help? This program believes that what is wrong is that some 40 million Americans have been short-circuited, virtually cut out of the American economy. Nearly a quarter of our people in the richest country in the world live in poverty. What has to be done is to convert that huge minority into an effective force in the economy. Then it will hum and our growth rate will rise and our crime rate will fall. We would like to explain what we mean in a moment. But first a message from our sponsor.

* * * * *

Mr. SMITH. What is poverty? Writer Dwight Macdonald defined it recently in the New Yorker magazine:

Mr. MACDONALD. Statistics for a family of four, any income that's less than $4,000 a year. For an individual, $2,000 a year.

Mr. SMITH. How many people live in poverty in America? Herman Miller of the Census Bureau in Washington gives a conservative estimate:

Mr. MILLER. We can estimate from the 1960 census that there were roughly 10 million families, about 30 million or so people, with incomes under $3,000. I would say that most of the poor are in this group. In addition, we have about another 3 million unrelated individuals, people living alone—mostly older people—I'd say, with incomes under $1,000.

Mr. SMITH. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, perhaps the leading expert on the question in Congress, tells who make up America's huge minority of poverty-stricken:

Senator RANDOLPH. These groups are largely the persons and the families often that are both unemployed and underemployed. There are 800,000 unemployed teenagers in the United States—they comprise in a large part the dropouts from school. They have few skills to contribute to a mechanized America and the unemployment rate in this group of teenagers is above the national average—it's almost three times above it—it's 15 percent. There are then approximately 17 million senior citizens, some call them elderly men and women, and these persons by and large, at least many of them, are living on meager incomes. They have shameful substandards of health and of housing and of nutrition and of recreation. Then we would add that third group, the 2 million migrant farm laborers and their families. They lack decent housing. They lack health conditions as they should be. The educational conditions are not adequate. They are only sporadically or seasonally employed. Then there are those racial minority groups. Some 17 million Negroes—and we must add the new immigrant Puerto Ricans. And then we must not overlook the Southwest and California, where the Mexicans are a large group of this overall group of which I have spoken. The unemployment among these people is 13 percent. And that's more than twice what the unemployment rate is among the white population within the United States.

Mr. SMITH. There's one particular category of people that you know a lot about and these are the people unemployed for what are called structural reasons. Could you tell me about them?

Senator RANDOLPH. Those are the unemployed men and women who are the victims of what we call structural changes in our economy. A cutting machine moves its nose into the coal under a mountainside in West Virginia. And the 100 men who once did that job are unemployed. We now produce almost as much coal as we did 15 years ago. But we produce that coal with approximately one-third of the manpower of the period that I have mentioned. I've been in these coal-mining towns. I've talked with these men who sit there often in idleness on the steps of the once-busy company store, or near the entrance to the mine. They have a home that hangs on a hillside. It is not a mansion, but it is a home. In that home they've reared their children. And their lives—these men—have been spent there in West Virginia.

Mr. SMITH. Typical of the homes described by Senator RANDOLPH is this one in Olcott, W. Va. It is 20 miles from the State capital of Charleston, but removed many times that distance from the comforts most Americans

consider normal. The house is occupied by the Fletcher family and is reached by a bumpy dirt road that winds through the valley. Mrs. Fletcher has lived in these hills all her life. Her home is too small for her family and the facilities are primitive. But the rent is cheap, and so they go on living here. Mr. Fletcher used to work as a plasterer, but there are no jobs around now and so he has been assigned to a Government relief project.

Reporter Don Dixon talked to Mrs. Fletcher about what it is like in the mountains:

Mr. DIXON. How many children do you have, Mrs. Fletcher?

Mrs. FLETCHER. I have nine.

Mr. DIXON. And your husband gets $165 a month?

Mrs. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. Does he get anything else besides that?

Mrs. FLETCHER. No, that's all he gets.

Mr. DIXON. How do you manage to raise a family on $165 a month? Can't be easy.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Our rent's not high. We pay rent of $7 a month. Then, there's my electricity—that runs right smart—on account of my stove. We make out pretty good. Just those two bills—my electric and rent.

Mr. DIXON. How about the food?

Mrs. FLETCHER. We always have something to eat. It may not be fancy, but we always have something.

Mr. DIXON. What do you miss most out here? What would you most like to have?

Mrs. FLETCHER. I'd like to have a lot of the conveniences that people have that live in town. I have to carry my water. We burn coal. And I don't have no automatic washer. I just wash my clothes and dry them outside. But we make out pretty good.

Mr. DIXON. Would you like to leave here if you could?

Mrs. FLETCHER. Well, I'd like to live in town, but I'd never leave West Virginia. I'd never go out of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. SMITH. This school is half a mile down the road from the Fletcher house. For most of these children, education is their only chance of escape from the poverty which hangs heavy on the hills.

Donna is the oldest Fletcher child and she wants to be a teacher when she grows up.

Mr. STERN. How old are you, Donna?

DONNA. Eleven.

Mr. STERN. And how many children are there in your family?

DONNA. Nine.

Mr. STERN. Well, there are 11 in your family. How many beds are there in the house?

DONNA. Around four or five.

Mr. SMITH. The mining areas are not the only ones to have suffered. This is the house of the Allman family on the outskirts of Charleston. For his family of six, Mr. Allman who works on a relief project gets $169 a month and a commodity ration of surplus foods. Mrs. Allman told us how she makes out.

Mr. DIXON. What will you be having for dinner tonight, Mrs. Allman?

Mrs. ALLMAN. Well, I'll fix some beans. We call them pinto beans. And then I'll have some mashed potatoes and gravy and possibly some hamburger, and maybe a green salad. We don't have that every day, but I try to get a salad in once a week.

Mr. DIXON. Do you find it hard to make the money and the commodities stretch?

Mrs. ALLMAN. Yes, I do. I tell you, you have to be a good manager, I think. Of course, sometimes my husband says I'm not—but we do have to stretch it. Every dollar has to be stretched until it almost breaks before we can do anything with it.

Mr. DIXON. Well, you know, this is supposed to be a very rich country. Do you feel any resentment about not having a lot of money in a country like this?

Mrs. ALLMAN. No, I'm not resentful. I'm thankful for what I've got. I'd like to have more, of course, but I'm not resentful to anybody. I'm glad that everybody else has got something.

Mr. SMITH. This broken down old building in Charleston used to be a school. But the times change, and now it is a distribution center for surplus food commodities. The food is given out once a month to those who qualify and in West Virginia that number keeps growing. For many of these people, commodities are the difference between starving or not. The menu isn't elaborate—canned meat, rice, dried beans, butter, cheese, flour, dried milk, shortening.

The amount varies, depending on the number of people in the family. But it averages out to about half a pound of food per person per day. Some of the food was packaged to be shipped overseas under the foreign aid program; but the need was found to be greater at home.

People must bring their own boxes or bags to carry the commodities home and sometimes a wagon comes in handy. Reporter Dixon talked to some of the men who receive the commodities.

Mr. DIXON. How long have you been on commodities, Mr. Heffman?

Mr. HEFFMAN. About 3 months.

Mr. DIXON. How much do you get?

Mr. HEFFMAN. I get it for seven which consists of lard, butter, flour, and so on, which it don't last a month, like it's supposed to.

Mr. DIXON. How long does it last?

Mr. HEFFMAN. From 2 to 3 weeks.

Mr. DIXON. What do you do after that?

Mr. HEFFMAN. That's a good question. I can't answer it.

Mr. DIXON. What did you do the last couple of weeks?

Mr. HEFFMAN. Well, my dad helped me some and my mother-in-law helped me some. If it hadn't been for them, we couldn't have made it.

Mr. ROSS. I get $85 plus my commodities; $85 covers my room rent, doctor, and medicine. What I have left over, it goes for food.

Mr. DIXON. Is that for you and your wife?

Mr. ROSS. That's for me and my wife, yes sir.

Mr. DIXON. Is that enough?

Mr. ROSS. Well, sir, it's not enough to live good on, but a man can make out on it if he has to. I pinch a penny and make it last—but sometimes it don't last. Sometimes I run out 3 or 4 days before I get my commodities. My check comes in first of the month. We don't throw anything away. It's all used.

Mr. DIXON. Are there times when you might go 3 or 4 days without food?

Mr. ROSS. At times—a couple of days, yes. I'll say that.

Mr. DIXON. Every month?

Mr. ROSS. Not every month.

Mr. DIXON. Does it seem things are getting worse in West Virginia, or better, or about the same?

Mr. ROSS. It seems to me to be about a little worse than it has been.

Mr. DIXON. Do you get any entertainment at all? Do you ever get to the films, or to buy a magazine or a newspaper?

Mr. ROSS. We don't take any of it. We don't even take a paper. I used to, but I quit taking a paper. Just couldn't afford it.

Mr. DIXON. How long have you been on commodities, Mr. McAllister?

Mr. MCALLISTER. Well that will be 2 years the 16th of next March.

Mr. DIXON. Have you tried to look for work in the meantime?

Mr. MCALLISTER. Yes, sir, everywhere I could find a job—I've tried.

Mr. DIXON. There just isn't anything around?

Mr. MCALLISTER. There just isn't anything to find.

Mr. DIXON. What sort of work have you looked for?

Mr. MCALLISTER. Well, sir, I tried commercial house painting, outside painting, inside painting—just take anything I can find. Ditch digging. Anything.

Mr. DIXON. Well, even if a man is willing to work around here, there aren't jobs around, are there?

Mr. MCALLISTER. None at all. Even if you prove yourself here, you don't have much of a chance—not in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. DIXON. What about your kids? Are they going to stay here?

Mr. MCALLISTER. If I have anything to do with it, no.

Mr. SMITH. Those are a very few of the forgotten and neglected Americans, the 30 to 40 million people who are permitted neither to receive the benefits nor contribute their labor to the wealth of the world's richest nation. We are doing practically nothing for them. Our generous farm programs dole out billions to well-off farmers, not to the impoverished ones. Our housing schemes build homes for middle-class Americans. For the poor, housing programs simply mean the bulldozer chases them from one slum to a worse-crowded slum to make space for homes for the better off. They are mostly not covered by social security. The President's planned tax cut will not reach them, for they do not make enough money to pay taxes anyhow.

Their existence exacerbates every national problem. Race troubles like those in industrial Birmingham, Ala. are made severe by unemployment and the fear of low-paid white workers that they may be displaced by lower-paid Negro workers.

Crime is made worse. Today crime rises 5 times as fast as our population.

In the Nation's Capital this week, it was announced that crime in January this year is 17 percent higher than it was in January last year.

Typical of dozens of crimes, on this spot on this street, Congressman HARLAN HAGEN of California was attacked and beaten recently, within half a mile of the Capitol Building.

At this place, after dark last week, an elderly woman arriving at the railroad station was attacked and beaten by a man. This is within 200 yards of the Capitol Building in Washington.

This week, churches in the Nation's Capital announced they were reversing a century's practice and locking doors to stop vandalism which is growing fierce in a society in which teenagers drop out of slum schools and can find no jobs, so they seek both excitement and money in a life of crime.

The quality of American life is in danger. There are two Americas—the rich and rather complacent top three-quarters, and the frustrated, left-out, bottom one-quarter, now growing savage and antisocial. One of their consequences is that they play no affirmative role in our economy. They starve the economy of a vast stimulus of consumer demand for the products of our industry. That is why our growth rate is the lowest in the Western World; why recession follows recession; why manpower and plant are idle and wasted.

What can be done about it? We will offer some answers in a moment. But first another message from our sponsor.

* * * * *

Mr. SMITH. What can be done to articulate the silent, idle market of the impoverished who could make our economy boom? One suggestion is that the Federal Government guarantee every family of four a minimum income of $4,000. It was made by writer, Dwight Macdonald:

Mr. MACDONALD. I think it should be the right of a citizen just the way we have free public schools. It seems to me that we

should not exclude so many of our citizens from our life because, really, to live in poverty is not to be a full-fledged American citizen.

Mr. SMITH. Herman Miller of the Census Bureau believes getting the economy going is the first priority.

Mr. MILLER. In the first place, the thing that we would have to do, and that would help most people would be to get full employment again. How many of the low-income groups won't be helped by full employment: the aged, your widows, other people who don't work. But for many of the unskilled, if they had regular employment, they would at least have a means of regular source of income and could keep going.

The second thing we have to do is to equalize opportunities for employment and for education. There are very large numbers of people in the United States who are simply never given the chance to get a good job, or to get good training. Many of them are educated and then they go out into the labor market and they can't find jobs. This not only makes people poor, it makes people bitter. And society pays in two ways: it pays because of their low incomes, their poverty; it pays to control them. It pays to put policemen in the schools; to keep them in our jails.

And the third thing we have to do is to stop the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next. And there is much more of this than we realize. So that somehow we must find the best talents that exist within our poor, within our discriminated, and develop them.

Mr. SMITH. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH believes in work projects Congress has been stalling on, projects to be supported by Federal Government expenditures.

Senator RANDOLPH. It's not just an expenditure. It is a capital investment. And when I say capital, it's an improvement to that community and the well-being of the people who live there. And I feel that when we employ these people, when we construct that project, we have returned not a hundred cents on that original dollar which is expended, but we have a dividend which is paid in a better America.

I feel that the President must be frankly more vigorous on meeting these so-called homefront problems. Because you know if we're not really a happy people here at home—if we're not a people to a relative degree—are, well, let us say, in an economy that gives us some substance, I don't think we're going to attach ourselves to these other problems international in scope. And I feel the President has not only the personality and the power to do this job, but if today I could spur him to do this by the words I speak—if the viewers and the listeners to this program, if they feel as do I, they might well through their own contacts—indirect and direct in some instances—impress upon the Chief Executive of our Republic the need to move more affirmatively, to act more positively in the areas which I discussed.

Mr. SMITH. The rest of this is going to be strictly my own opinion.

The President's tax-cut plan will give the economy a temporary shot in the arm.

But it evades the basic problem of the Nation's economy. No matter how much you stimulate the investing public by cutting their taxes, they will not make many bold investments if the market for their goods remains sluggish.

What is needed is government action on a very large scale long-range plan to get income to the 30 to 40 million Americans who live in poverty. They are so poor that they will pour that money back into the economy as quickly as they get it. With a tremendous spurt in sales, investors will then invest—tax cut or not.

The money should not be just a handout as it often was under the New Deal. It should be paid out to do things in America that will permanently end poverty.

Build more schools to replace overcrowded slum schools. Have a bolder education plan in general. Have urban renewal programs for the very poor and for no one else for awhile.

For the elderly, have a real medicare plan like those in allied Western Europe. In my opinion no American over 65 should pay a dollar for health care.

For youth, the President's youth employment plan sent to Congress last Thursday is good enough as a starter.

There are a hundred other programs that in 5 or 10 years' time would change America greatly for the better, decrease crime, raise our growth rate, and in every way make this Nation unbeatable in the cold war or any kind of competition.

The programs take money—lots of money. Spending, our negative legislators call it; but the proper name is investment, the shrewdest, most profitable investment we can make.

It means forcing the negative men who dominate Congress to become affirmative. And that means that the President will have to do what to date he has been allergic to doing—fight for his legislation. And fighting does not mean speaking a few words on this subject among 30 others at an occasional news conference.

What is wrong with the American economy is—it is being starved of purchasing power some 35 million impoverished American should have.

What needs to be done is to get that purchasing power to them for projects that will permanently elevate them to first-class American citizenship.

Good night.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Friday, February 22, 1963, I had the pleasure of addressing the New York State Society of the Cincinnati Union Club, an organization which dates back to the Revolutionary War. The first president of this society was George Washington.

My remarks dealt with what I feel are the right ways and the wrong ways for dealing with Communists and other subversives in America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE ANNUAL WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY DINNER OF THE NEW YORK STATE SOCIETY OF THE CINCINNATI UNION CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 22, 1963

We meet in New York tonight to celebrate the memory of the father of our country.

All who reflect upon the life of Washington will be touched by the feeling that there is something inscrutable, something elusive, something difficult to capture about this great man who is separated from us by a span of two centuries.

The artist who conceived the monument to Washington in our Nation's Capital must have been similarly baffled.

When the Lincoln Memorial was erected, it was Lincoln the man, in all of his humanity, that was immortalized in stone; it was the qualities of the man that were reproduced: his humility, his simplicity, his melancholy, his brooding passion for justice.

When we raised a monument to Thomas Jefferson it was, again, Jefferson, the man, who emerged, standing lifelike, surrounded by engravings of his most famous words, in a beautiful setting which is so in harmony with what we know of Jefferson the artist and statesman.

But there was something about Washington which defied such a representation. He represented to the artist and to succeeding generations of Americans something that could not be captured in a statue, something larger than life, something unnaturally noble and lofty, solid, upright, shining. And so the national monument to his memory took the form of a great and gleaming shaft, soaring skyward, possessing a hint of eternity.

It was what Washington did, what he stood for, what he left to us and to all men that comes to mind when we think of him.

When Washington first took command of the Continental Forces at Cambridge, he found a group of men so undisciplined, ill-equipped, and disorganized as to be unworthy of the name of an army; and through the force of his genius and his character he left it 7 years later, an army victorious in the War for Independence.

Washington found 13 subjugated colonies, under the heel of the world's greatest power, and he left them free and independent States.

He found a group of discordant, disunited States, and through his stature, his counsel, and his patience he provided a unifying force and left a nation united under the noblest of all charters, the Constitution of the United States.

He found a new and untried government, a strange and infant phenomenon on the face of the earth; and he left the Great Republic which, under his leadership and through his example, emerged as a going concern, ready for the long journey envisioned by the Founding Fathers.

What should be our sentiments as we reflect upon Washington? Respect, gratitude, admiration, reverence? Yes, all of these and more. And because his life was inseparably woven into the fabric of our national life, our veneration of Washington is inseparable from patriotism, from respect for our Nation's role in history, from gratitude for its citizenship, from admiration for its achievements, from reverence for its free institutions, which we rightly look upon as the fountainhead of all our manifold blessings.

We are here tonight, then, not only to venerate the memory of a great man; we are here to dedicate ourselves anew to the ideas and the ideals of Washington which live on and flourish in perilous times.

So far as Washington and the Founding Fathers were concerned, the ideals of the American Revolution were self-evident propositions, and they so stated in the Declaration of Independence. Even at that early day, Washington and the others believed that the validity of man's rights and freedoms was a closed issue, something that was forever decided, something that they fought a war over and wrote immutably into the Constitution of the United States.

This concept of eternal, self-evident rights, arising from the nature of man and his relationship to the Creator, is under a mighty challenge today, a twofold challenge.

From without, totalitarianism makes a direct challenge; from within, doubt, disbelief, and indifference make an insidious challenge.

Most of the time this second challenge, like an iceberg, is largely beneath the surface. Occasionally, some controversial event will bring it to the forefront, such as the invitation to Alger Hiss to appear on television, or the public appearance of George Lincoln Rockwell the Nazi leader, and Gus Hall the Communist leader, before highly respected groups.

The public appearances of these warped and discredited figures are not of great im-

portance, in themselves. But the attitudes of loyal Americans who promote and defend these spectacles is significant and it is of this that I shall speak principally tonight.

The fundamental ideal of our Nation is freedom of choice. Upon this principle all of our institutions are founded and from it, all have evolved. Our approaches to government, to economics, to education, to the press—all are fashioned out of this principle of free choice.

In the nature of things, a nation founded upon free choice must indulge freedom to the widest limit possible. There must be not only freedom for the wise and the responsible and the respectable, but freedom for the ignorant, the irresponsible, the ridiculous, even the contemptible. To preserve freedom to be right, we must also preserve freedom to be wrong.

But there is one extreme latitude that even advocates of free choice cannot indulge and that is the freedom to destroy free choice—the dissent which threatens the right to dissent. There is one intellectual position that men who believe in freedom cannot entertain with any feeling other than loathing and contempt, and that is the proposition that men ought not to have freedom.

We in America are tolerant of almost any view but some things we have decided upon for all time; among these things are freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of the ballot box. These freedoms are so fundamental to our heritage that they are, to use the diplomatic term, nonnegotiable.

Yet there are groups among us which, openly or covertly, challenge these assumptions.

Chief among them is the Communist Party of the United States. I need not labor the point that the Communist Party makes a complete and total challenge to everything we believe about freedom and the nature of man. Where they are able, the Communists impose their ideology by force and terror. Where they cannot do this, as in the United States, they seek our destruction through subversion, through espionage, through poisoning our intellectual and moral climate, through covertly attempting to mold our public opinion and public policy so as to coincide with the interests of the Soviet Union.

This internal challenge of the Communists is of tremendous importance. The threat, in itself, is important and the proof of this is the sorry history of its successful manipulation of Government policy at critical times, its stealing of vital secrets, its misdirection of public opinion. But it is not my purpose to discuss this aspect tonight.

The threat is also important because of the reaction to it of the American people. Our reaction demonstrates what we think of our American heritage; and it is what we think of our heritage that will, in the final analysis, determine whether it shall or shall not survive.

There are three types of mistaken reactions to this threat:

If we react to the Communist challenge by establishing police state methods in this country we begin to build up a machinery of repression which is foreign to our ideals, alien to the Constitution, and which can at any time be turned by unscrupulous or misguided men against legitimate dissent (that is, dissent which accepts the ideal of free choice). I never want to see a law in the United States which would prevent Gus Hall from speaking because under other circumstances, at other times, the same law might be used to silence a future John Kennedy or a future Dwight Eisenhower.

A second misguided reaction is to go to the other extreme, as some are doing today, and contend that our free heritage dictates that we must not only forbear to lock up Communists, but that we must also welcome them on our public platforms, on our campuses, on our school faculties, in radio and television, and in public office. I oppose this just as strenuously as I oppose the first alternative.

Out of respect for our own free institutions and out of concern for their preservation, we permit our sworn enemies to exercise the basic rights of Americans. But I believe it should end there. They are not entitled to any position of authority or influence; to any position of favor or respect or dignity in our country. They must always be singled out for what they are, and that is as sworn enemies of everything good that America has brought to the world.

The third mistaken reaction to the challenge of those who deny the validity of man's freedom is the reaction of indifference.

Some say, or reveal by their actions, that they do not care about an issue which all Americans should and must care about.

Some faculties say, "let our students invite Communist agents to lecture to them. We do not endorse the invitation, but we say it is their business."

A television executive will say, "Let a traitor and a convicted perjurer appear on our network to ridicule the character of a great public servant who has lived by the processes of free debate, free choice, and free elections. We despise the traitor and what he represents," says the executive, "but he is free to use our facilities."

Others will defend the right of known subversives, or those with many subversive affiliations, to occupy Government posts or positions on college faculties.

This is the attitude of indifference to the trampling upon of what ought to be held sacred. Let me illustrate:

Three years ago, when Khrushchev was visiting this country on a state visit there was a considerable movement afoot to bring him onto the floor of the Senate to address that body. When I thought of those great bronze doors to the Senate Chamber, upon which are engraved memorable scenes in the life of Washington, being thrown open to admit the archenemy of everything which Washington and this country represent, I felt sick at heart.

It was not that I feared that Khrushchev would make any conversions or do any direct damage to the country by appearing in a forum hitherto reserved for the friends of freedom. I was depressed not because of this, but because of the mockery involved, because of the desecration. If you saw someone pull down the American flag and trample upon it, you would not fear for the future of the country, but you would feel an inner revulsion and a sickness at heart to see the desecration of something noble and sacred.

This is exactly what happens when a Communist makes a public appearance at a free university. The danger stems not from him but from the indifference and apathy and blindness that our acceptance of these appearances signifies about ourselves.

There is a right way for a free people to deal with avowed enemies of freedom without violating our Constitution, our convictions, or our self-respect. That way is twofold:

First, there are constitutional legal remedies enacted by the Congress and approved by the Supreme Court, for dealing with certain overt acts of treason, acts which violate even the broadest interpretation of the Bill of Rights. So far as the actual forceful repression of Communists goes, it should be left to these laws.

Let the Communists enjoy all the legal protections afforded by our system of justice, not because it is owed to them, but because we owe it to ourselves, to our great past and to our free future.

These laws need to be strengthened in some respects and I favor strengthening them so long as it is done within the spirit of the Constitution. But such laws will always be to a large extent inadequate because the Constitution is designed to protect freedom and not to impose repression.

The larger protection against the spread of totalitarian doctrines must reside in the hearts and minds of the American people. They can react to Communists and other purveyors of twisted doctrines by exercising their freedom to ignore and reject them; by refusing to listen to the unspeakable, by refusing to honor the dishonorable.

Let me illustrate this by recounting to you an event that took place in New Haven, Conn.

A year ago there was an attempt made by some Yale students to bring Gus Hall, the head of the American Communist Party, to the Yale campus to deliver a lecture as he has done at many other American universities and colleges.

This is a significant example because Hall is not merely a suspected Communist or some mooney radical, he is the top Communist in the United States; a hardened conspirator, trained in Moscow in everything from the use of explosives to the use of propaganda. He was convicted under the Smith Act for conspiring to forceably overthrow our Government and has served several years in the Federal penitentiary. He is currently under indictment for further violations of our security laws. He is therefore a conscious agent of a foreign enemy which is attempting to destroy academic freedom and all other freedoms in this country.

The question of whether or not to invite him was openly debated a year ago. Those who opposed the invitation effectively argued that inviting Hall would be a needless debasement of the principle of academic freedom. The end result was that the students exercised their free choice by refusing to invite Hall.

This year another group did invite Hall to speak. Last week he came to the campus and addressed an overflow audience of students and faculty members. According to the New Haven newspapers he was warmly applauded both at the beginning and at the end of his remarks and evoked frequent laughter during his half-hour address.

Thus was a well-known and unmistakable enemy of our Nation's free traditions welcomed at one of the foremost universities in the free world.

Now I do not believe that Hall's greeting at Yale, regrettable though it was, signifies that he made any conversions to communism. I say this despite the fact that the political editor of the Yale Daily News wrote me a letter describing Hall as a "moderate socialist who wants to help man, but is not quite sure how to do it."

We can only hope that the Yale student body is a little more sophisticated than its political editor.

The real tragedy here is that several hundred young men, products of the finest training that free society can give, so forgot their free heritage as to pay tribute and show favor to a man who is the embodiment of everything that free men should shun and abhor.

The Yale Daily News defended Hall's appearance as a vindication of academic freedom by the Yale student body. But there was no question of academic freedom involved.

Their right to invite Hall was not challenged so they need not wear false martyrs robes. They are not in any way denied all the information they want about communism. They have a library full of books about communism, written by Communists and non-Communists alike. They have

available to them the Communist newspapers in which they can read Gus Hall's speeches to their hearts' content. They all know this. And they know also that in listening to Hall they are getting no exchange of free ideas. Free speech is impossible for a true Communist. They knew they would hear the party line and they know that if the party line changes tomorrow Hall will change his speeches tomorrow to reflect it.

They had, therefore, other motives:

They were curious to get a look at a real live Communist agent and so they placed their curiosity above their patriotism.

They wanted to lay a wreath before the shrine of nonconformity, so they listened to a speech by the No. 1 conformist in America.

They got a childish psychological kick out of applauding the leading American representative of organized inhumanity, and they were willing to purchase this kick at the price of degrading their own inheritance as trustees of the free heritage of America.

Their reasons are unimportant really, except that they demonstrate that the reverence for freedom is held so cheaply by some that they are willing to trade it in for such trinkets and trivia as I have described.

The students of Yale may further exercise their freedom by inviting George Lincoln Rockwell to lecture them about the virtues of nazism and, in the name of academic freedom, to defend the mass murder of millions of Jews and the glories of tyranny.

The same false logic that prompted them to invite Hall should prompt them to invite Rockwell, and probably will. If it does, so much the worse for them; so much the worse for Yale; so much the worse for our country.

Hall would not have been invited to Yale by men who placed the same value upon liberty as did Washington and the Founding Fathers. And had he appeared uninvited in the midst of such men, he would have been greeted not by a large and friendly audience but by the silence and contempt of an empty hall.

Washington knew that freedom was not an invitation to intellectual anarchy. He knew that freedom carried with it the responsibility for men and for nations to make final decisions about things; to stand irrevocably for some things and to hold certain basic assumptions about freedom to be unchallengeable and incontrovertible, because they were self-evident.

Why is all this important? It is important for this reason:

If our free tradition does not imbue our people with a love for freedom so fervent that it shudders at the thought of the Halls and Rockwells and all the apparatus of slavery, how can we expect them to feel the zeal for preserving and advancing freedom which they must feel if our Nation is not only to survive but to go forward and attain in fuller measure the ideals of freedom and democracy for all men?

Those of us who have in our hands a responsibility for influencing public opinion and guiding the education and development of our young people must look to this problem. We must, through our informational media, through our pulpits, through our schools, through our public forums and through the example of our lives do a much better job than we are doing of portraying the ideals of the American Revolution.

If we succeed in this then we will not have to lament the fact that Communists and Nazis are taking advantage of our American freedoms. For our people will use their freedoms to reject and isolate the wrong and to affirm and embrace the right.

It has been said that the example of a good life is more effective in influencing people than the greatest sermons ever preached. In the end, the example of the lives of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and others will do more to inspire a reverence for human freedom than any words of ours.

That is why I am honored to have been invited to take part in this commemoration of the birth of perhaps the greatest of all Americans.

The English poet, Lord Byron, said this of Washington:

> "Where may the wearied eye repose,
> When gazing on the Great,
> Where neither guilty glory glows,
> Nor despicable state?
> Yes—one—the first—the last—the best—
> The Cincinnatus of the West,
> Whom envy dared not hate,
> Bequeath the name of Washington,
> To make man blush there was but one!"

Our presence here tonight is but one unneeded proof that the passage of time has vindicated Byron's judgment.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on February 11, at the sixth annual Alumni Consumer Credit Management Conference at Columbia University, held at Arden House, near New York City, our colleague, Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, presented a masterful analysis of the question raised by proposals to use the power of the Federal Government to control and police the extension of consumer credit.

This analysis ranged far beyond the limited proposal contained in S. 750, which is back again before the Senate. I think the statement is very valuable to all Senators, because it puts the so-called credit disclosure bill into focus. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD V. LONG BEFORE THE SIXTH ANNUAL ALUMNI CONSUMER CREDIT MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 11, 1963

It is a real pleasure to be here today and to participate in your program.

I would like to begin our discussion by posing a question. That is, "When, in what form, and for what purposes should the Federal Government legislate in the field of consumer credit or should the Federal Government directly regulate consumer credit at all?"

In general terms, I believe we can all agree on an answer to this question if directed to the broad field of business. Most of us can agree that regulation by the Federal Government may be necessary in times of war or national emergency and also may be necessary to preserve economic opportunity. We can also agree that legislation designed to regulate business may be necessary when the separate States cannot effectively carry out laws which will promote the economic well-being of individuals. On the other hand, we can also agree that it is difficult and time consuming to change laws once they are enacted and that the administration of some laws leaves much to be desired.

With few caveats we can agree on principle because we have inherited and absorbed essentially the same ideals. We accept a basic belief in freedom with its inherent limitations. Hard as it is to define, each of us has an understanding of the ideas involved.

But having agreed on principle, we are still left a wide area for discussion and disagreement. This disagreement stems from the fact that each of us as an individual has his own set of deep-seated beliefs about economic regulation. Some of these beliefs are well founded. Some beliefs are based on information obtained over the years, some of which is currently applicable and some really irrelevant. These differing beliefs arise in part because we are members of a particular profession, business organization, political party or other group. Being involved in specific pursuits, we not only have deep-seated beliefs but we also have interests which we want protected. Each of us in our own mind develops solutions to problems which arise in the field of consumer credit—or in any other area for that matter.

In particular, each of us is committed to a favorite interpretation of constitutional provisions concerning trade and finance. However, we must face the fact that the Constitution is couched in broad terms—there is a wide area for interpretation. If this were not so, we would find many times 23 amendments. In fact, there have been really only 13 amendments since the first 10 were adopted almost simultaneously with the original document. It is nothing short of a miracle that a written Constitution could provide a sound government for an 18th century agrarian society and a 20th century industrial society without greater change.

As the complexion of business activity has changed over the years, its relationship to the commerce clause and the money clause has changed. This has resulted in a continuous development of the law. It is important that our system of law evolve with changing economic and social conditions. But before change takes place we should establish that the change will result in improvements. For example, we cannot assume that Federal regulation of consumer credit has some very definite advantages over State regulation. It is well to remember that largeness results in increased administrative problems and possible increased costs. As those of you in large companies know—it is a real problem to establish procedures or detailed policy on a companywide basis and have these regulations followed. Even when they are followed there is the danger of destroying individual initiative at all levels. A very similar situation exists with the Federal Government.

Given these preliminary and very general statements, I will try to develop some more specific ideas concerning consumer credit and Federal legislation. My comments will be in the following main directions: (1) The general success of State legislation and some areas that suggest change; (2) the entry of the Federal Government directly into consumer credit regulation; and (3) the effects of general legislation on those who lend to consumers. During the course of this discussion I hope to be able to bring out some ideas that may suggest ways that businessmen and others could be somewhat more helpful in legislative matters—and at the same time obtain at least some of the results they seek.

Consumer credit is an area which to date with the exception of regulation W, has not been subject directly to Federal legislation. The present institutions specializing in consumer credit all came into being early in this century. If you recall, this was the time when the effects of the wage system were being felt on a wide basis. We had reached the stage where money came into real importance for everyday exchanges. Reflecting this monetization of the economy, the Federal Reserve System was brought into being, State legislation governing hours and conditions of work was widespread and State legislation in the consumer credit field began to appear.

The need for consumer credit legislation was well established by the studies of the Russell Sage Foundation. The resulting legislation was supported by social reformers and a considerable segment of lenders. They

recognized that wage earners were forced into borrowing for emergencies and had no alternative but to pay whatever was asked. But equally important they saw the need for laws which recognized that there was an economic demand for loans and that to make small loans was a costly proposition. Thus, an important step forward was taken from the age-old concept of usury. The new approach was one of permitting an interest rate which would provide for a sufficient return on capital to encourage legitimate businessmen to enter the field but at the same time would protect the consumer borrower. This concept is still the basis for State regulation and should remain so no matter what government imposes regulations.

Following the enactment of this legislation early in the 1900's two different types of organizations appeared almost simultaneously. Both were able to make charges which were considerably above those previously allowed by law. The uniform small loan law was geared to having business firms supply cash loans. The credit union was adapted from the cooperative approach becoming important in continental Europe—the idea of a group of people with a community of interests helping each other. The Morris plan sprang up about the same time, and subsequently, the commercial banks entered the field of consumer credit. Both the Morris plan and commercial bank lending to consumers were permitted by changing interpretations of the general interest or usury laws.

For some decades no serious thought was given to the Federal Government entering the field of regulating consumer credit. Then came our entry into World War II. It became an important national objective to divert the productive capacity of the country into the production of armaments and war goods and to direct as much as possible of consumer income into financing the war effort. To achieve these objectives, the production of automobiles and other consumer durables was curtailed, and price controls, wage controls, and rationing were instituted. By this time consumer credit had become an important element in the economic picture. At the end of 1941, total short and intermediate term consumer credit was $9.2 billion. These credit obligations amounted to 9.6 percent of the $96.3 billion personal income received during that year. Thus along with other forms of price control and wage control, the so-called regulation W type of selective control of credit was instituted. Essentially, this regulation required all credit grantors to register and specified certain downpayments and contract maturities for each type of durable consumer goods.

This regulation also specified conditions for the renewal and extension of existing credit. In effect, regulation W was instituted as an anti-inflationary device—the idea being that this direct limit on the amount of credit available to consumers would help reduce their demand for goods in short supply. This regulation was retained, again as an anti-inflationary device until toward the end of 1947. It was suspended temporarily, then reimposed for 9 months in 1948–49, was again suspended in 1949 and reimposed late in 1950. Finally an act of Congress as of June 30, 1952, terminated the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to impose the regulation W type of control.

Since that time there has been no direct regulation of consumer credit by the Federal Government. At intervals there have been suggestions that a need exists for the Federal Reserve to have stand-by authority to impose this selective control over consumer credit. Especially was this true during, and immediately following the year 1955, during which installment credit outstanding increased by 25 percent. This very rapid increase in the outstandings of installment credit led the President to request a study by the Federal Reserve Board of installment credit and its impact on the economy. The result of this study was the very imposing six-book "Consumer Installment Credit Study," published in 1957. This study provides an excellent statement of views of individuals on the usefulness of regulations as well as economic analyses of the effects of consumer credit on the economy. It is the source of the most comprehensive and authoritative information available, up to that time, on consumer credit.

Since that time there have been occasions when the subject of selective controls on consumer credit has been considered in Congress. However, there has been a growing awareness that the application of such controls entails often unforeseen difficulties and raises many new problems. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in his letter to me dated January 16 of this year referred to the following statement of the Board's views which summarize these difficulties:

"As indicated above, the selective regulation of the use of credit by consumers raises many problems beyond those implied in the general restraint of credit-financed demands. Such regulation has been vigorously opposed by interested groups whenever it has been proposed. After weighing the many conflicting arguments enumerated in the study submitted by the Board in 1957 (see pt. I, vol. I, ch. 16), the Congress may determine that the balance favors establishment of permanent authority to regulate consumer credit. To be fully effective, such authority would have to cover long as well as short and intermediate term credit and should be permanent, broad, and flexible in character. Application of the regulations should be limited to periods when the need is sufficient to justify the considerable burden such regulation imposes on the businesses directly affected and toleration of the discriminatory aspects which are unavoidable.

"The Board does not feel justified, at this time, in taking the initiative in a recommendation to Congress in this matter. The effectiveness and workability of this kind of selective regulation depends heavily on broadly based acceptance and support. Whether such support exists can best be determined in the forums of the Congress itself."

This is a good summary of the disenchantment with the selective type of control over consumer credit as an effective adjunct to general monetary controls.

Administrative difficulties in implementing selective controls on consumer credit were also commented upon in "The Report of the Commission on Money and Credit" published in 1961. The report on page 74 points up these problems:

"The difficulty of efficient administration of selective controls over consumer credit is a major argument against them. Past experience shows that evasion is a constant problem. A minimum ratio of downpayments on some durable goods, such as automobiles, have been bypassed by changing ostensible trade-in allowances. The growth of leasing could permit consumers to acquire cars on terms which might differ significantly from those being imposed by the credit authorities.

"Regulation of consumer credit terms might contribute to cyclical stability, but it would require a large and complex administration to be fully effective. The benefits to stability promised by such a system might be weighed against the cost and inconvenience of installing and managing it."

The bills before Congress which would require the statement of total finance charges in dollars and as the simple annual rate which the charge bears to the principal amount of credit are different in substance from regulation W. They are based on the dual assumption that the consumer does not know the cost of credit, and if he did he would use less credit, or behave differently. Bills of this type have been introduced in both Houses in the past two Congresses.

The House bills have been referred to committee and then no further action was taken. On the other hand, the Senate bill, in each case, has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and hearings have been held. The first Senate bill was introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress. At that time, 1960, it was given the number S. 2755 and the title, "Consumer Credit Labeling Bill." Hearings were held before the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, and an 898-page hearing record resulted. In 1961, a very similar bill was introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It was entitled "Truth in Lending Bill," was assigned number S. 1740, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Hearings were again held before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization and a hearing record of 1,388 pages resulted. In 1962, during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, hearings were held on S. 1740 with certain modifications and a hearing record of 416 pages resulted. We now have 2,702 pages of testimony and exhibits relating to the question of whether all credit grantors should be required to state their finance charges as total dollar amount and also as a simple annual rate on the amount financed.

During the course of these hearings, much heat and some light was generated. Governmental agencies testified to the need, or lack thereof, for such a type of bill. Some agencies referred to the administrative difficulties in enforcing the requirements of such a bill and made various other comments concerning this type of legislation. Consumer groups testified to the need for consumers to understand what credit costs them. They also related a number of examples of unfortunate individuals who had been taken in. The affected business groups testified as to the difficulties and even the impossibility of complying with regulations of this type. Retailers produced a massive amount of evidence to suggest that the cost of credit might well be intermingled with the price of goods resulting in a situation where the cash customer would absorb some of the costs of credit and there would be less known about its cost than is true today. The President last year in his consumer message to Congress endorsed in general terms credit disclosure legislation.

As a result of these hearings, there is a wider understanding among the American people of some of the problems involved in the field of consumer credit; there is probably a better understanding of the various trade practices in stating consumer credit charges, and there may be even a better understanding of what various percentages mean. Also, it may well be that some State legislation has been speeded up—legislation to help correct some of the abuses brought out in the hearings. For example, legislation requiring that retail installment contracts spell out the finance charges, fees, delinquency charges, and closing costs is now in effect in 24 States and Michigan will become the 25th on March 28. Along the same line, there is the growing acceptance by the States of the Uniform Commercial Code—14 States have adopted this code since 1953, Georgia and Oregon are scheduled to adopt it this year, and Michigan and New York in 1964.

The question still remains, however, "Would the Douglas-type bill serve to correct problems which face the consumer in the credit marketplace?" This question has not been answered to the satisfaction of all legislators concerned. In fact, I am one

who believes it would not correct problems which face the consumer.

Experience with this legislation does illustrate one point that I would like to make today, that is, the need for more effective communication between legislators and those who would be affected primarily by legislation. One of the problems in effective communication is the resort to emotional labels. In its original form, Senator DOUGLAS' bill was entitled the "Consumer Credit Labeling Bill." Somewhere along the line it developed other names. Its sponsors called it the truth in lending bill. Its opponents called it the credit control bill, or the credit proportion distortion bill. This bit of labeling certainly reduced the area of objective consideration of the need or lack of need for this type of legislation. These problems of semantics arise in everything we do, so it may be too much to hope to do away with emotional labeling of legislative bills.

The real question is how to live with this approach at labeling and still solve legislative problems in an equitable manner. One thought is that more attention should be given by those who testify to defining clearly the problem and providing factual evidence to back up the position taken. In the case of business firms, this can be done by having a strong research unit in a trade association with the assigned task of having data as complete as possible on the industry and related areas. Combine this with a definite policy stand and a knowledgeable public relations presentation and there is a tremendous impact on legislators and their constituents. A good example of the results of this combination of efforts—research, policy stand, and public relations—is the volume "The Consumer Finance Industry" which was recently published by Prentice-Hall as one volume in the "Library of Money and Credit." All too frequently, however, there is no well-defined policy stand and too little attention to the establishment of the factual basis.

Before closing, I would like to summarize current legislation which is being proposed or considered and which concerns the field of consumer credit. Senator DOUGLAS has stated that he will again introduce his bill requiring specific forms for the disclosure of finance charges and rates. At least two bills of this sort have already been introduced in the House. Thus the question of disclosure of finance charges and rates and the Federal Government's entry into this field will still be the subject of discussion in the legislative arena this year. Another area of direct interest to consumer credit is that of H.R. 71, commonly referred to as the Celler bill, which is described as "a bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing and insuring the sales of their products."

Though not directly related to consumer credit, the Federal bankruptcy law is necessarily of concern to all those who finance consumers. This law, as in previous years, will no doubt be subject to minor changes during this Congress. There appears to be no likelihood of a very comprehensive or widespread revision in this law at this time. As you no doubt know, the consumer bankruptcy committee of the American Bar Association is studying the problem of consumer bankruptcies, including the use of chapter 13, and other specific sections of the Bankruptcy Act having to do with consumer bankruptcies. Also it is studying the problem of State laws with regard to garnishment and other provisions as they are related to the Federal Bankruptcy Act. It will no doubt be some time before these studies are complete and before there are suggestions brought out for a comprehensive revision of the bankruptcy law.

Credit life insurance has become an important aspect in the field of consumer credit. The investigation by the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee of the insurance industry could conceivably at some time in the future have a bearing upon the field of consumer credit. The subcommittee has already investigated aviation and ocean marine insurance and State rating bureaus. It is planned to look into other types this year. It is possible that life insurance will be considered some time in the future and with it the operations of credit life insurance. However, there are no specific plans at this time.

Of much broader scope, but still of interest to every business enterprise are the tax revisions which are coming up before this Congress. Revisions in the corporate income tax are, of course, of concern to the vast majority of private companies. The President in his state of the Union message, budget message, and economic message suggested that the corporate income tax structure should be reformed to eliminate some of the so-called loopholes which have developed in the implementation of the present law. Of all the changes in the corporate tax structure recommended by the President in his tax message of January 24, I believe the one relating to the surtax exemption for subsidiaries is of greatest concern to most of you here. The President in his message said:

"Since the $25,000 surtax exemption and the new 22 percent normal rate are designed to stimulate small business, this reduction should be accompanied by action designed to eliminate the advantage of the multiple surtax exemptions now available to large enterprises operating through a chain of separately incorporated units. I, therefore, recommend that legislation be enacted which, over a transitional period of 5 years, will limit to one the number of surtax exemptions allowed an affiliated corporate group subject to 80 percent common control. This proposal would apply both to affiliated groups having a common corporate parent and to enterprises sharing common individual ownership. It will add $120 million annually to tax receipts.

"On the other hand, if affiliated corporations are treated as an entity for the surtax exemption and other purposes, they should be permitted to obtain the advantages of filing consolidated returns without incurring the present tax of 2 percent on the net income of all corporations filing such returns. The 2-percent tax was removed in 1954 from consolidated returns of regulated public utility enterprises, and I recommend that it be repealed for all corporate enterprises beginning in 1964. This proposal will contribute to a more realistic corporate tax rate structure and reduce the adverse effect of high marginal tax rates on growth—at an annual cost to the Treasury of only $50 million."

These recommendations and the others contained in the message are just beginning their course through the Congress. It is highly probable that many changes will come about as the pros and cons of these recommendations are brought out before the Congress. Some of the recommendations may be deleted entirely.

In actual practice, any tax bill enacted is put together by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Normally, few significant changes are made in such a bill once it is before the House or Senate for debate. Therefore, I would urge you to bring your suggestions and objections to the attention of the proper committee in time for their study and consideration. This can be done directly or through your Senators and Congressmen.

In conclusion, I would summarize my own views pretty much as follows:

1. From my own experience in State government, I know that State regulation of consumer credit can be effective and think it is in most States.

2. There are already many and diverse regulatory agencies whose policies affect consumer credit. The Federal Reserve through its rediscount and other policies encourages or discourages credit expansion. In this way, the supply of consumer credit and other forms of credit are effectively regulated. Commercial banks are subject to examination and/or various forms of regulation by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and State banking examiners. Consumer finance companies, since they borrow funds from commercial banks, are indirectly subject to all of these regulatory bodies and directly regulated by State banking departments.

3. If a disclosure bill is passed, and I do not believe it will be, it should be based on the following principles:

(a) Provide for full disclosure in a workable manner.

(b) Be a law which can be easily and equitably administered and one which does not unduly increase the costs of doing business.

(c) Apply only to those consumer credit areas not regulated by State statutes which require disclosure; and

(d) Be limited strictly to the disclosure of the costs of credit.

4. Lastly, any law which is passed should not turn the already overburdened Federal courts into police courts for thousands of infractions which arise from an unworkable law.

Now I will throw the floor open to your discussion of what has been said and will be happy to answer, or try to answer, any and all questions.

COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 15 years ago on February 24–26, 1948, the democratic Government of Czechoslovakia was overthrown by means of a bloodless coup and the people of this once free nation were subjugated by a Communist regime which destroyed their liberty and brought them under the control of Soviet Russia. On the anniversary of this tragic event the Czechoslovak National Council of America has prepared a report based on a study of personal letters from Czechoslovak citizens to their relatives in the United States and illustrating what communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks.

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

A REPORT ON COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AS TOLD TO AMERICANS

Fifteen years ago, on February 24, 1948, Communists took over Czechoslovakia with Soviet assistance, under the personal supervision of Moscow's hatchetman Valerian Zorin, the recent troublemaker at the United Nations. At first, the Communists made an effort to bluff the free world into believing that the seizure had been the act of a free people. Now that pretense is no longer necessary, the Communists brazenly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the democratic government and how much they depended on Soviet help.

What communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia and how much it has changed their lives is born out in thousands of letters received by American relatives. The Czechoslovak National Council of

America, an organization of Americans of Czechoslovak descent, with headquarters in Chicago and branches in a number of cities, has made a study of personal mail from Czechoslovakia and on the basis of this information concludes that Christmas 1962 in Czechoslovakia was the worst since 1945, the first postwar Christmas when the country was left bare by the Nazis.

In their letters, Czechoslovak citizens complain: "If one is not young enough and strong enough to queue up for hours from very early morning for a ration of 4 ounces of butter and 1 pound of margarine, there is nothing left within a few hours. Electricity is shut off early. Prague streets are dark. Trains are unheated. There is a fuel shortage. In the mining town of Kladno near Prague, people stood in line for 20 pounds of coal, which they had to carry home in sacks, when and if they got any. Water pipes are frozen, but former plumbers are not allowed to take house calls and repair the damage; instead, people must wait until a government agency assigns a workman to the job. Since industry, farms, business, and professions have all been expropriated without compensation by the government and are government-owned and operated, government agencies alone decide what should be done, by whom, for whom, and when, if at all. Consequently, the average citizen waits for weeks for the repair of pipes, furnace, roof or crumbling wall. Should he wish to repair it himself, he is not given the material with which to do it, not even a bag of cement.

Service to customers is also very poor as there is no business competition and personal initiative. One waits for weeks, even for months, for a suit to be cleaned and shoes to be resoled. The quality of goods is far inferior to what it used to be. Despite the fact that every able-bodied—and not so able-bodied—man and woman are hard at work, there is a scarcity of almost everything and the prices of consumer goods are very high.

The reason for this is Red Czechoslovakia's foreign policy: acting as a spearhead for the Soviet Union, the Prague regime gives considerable economic aid to the underdeveloped and neutralist countries the Soviets are trying to woo to their side. This is why the Prague regime has been supplying Castro with food, considerable technical aid, and arms. In return, Czechoslovakia has received some unwanted Cuban sugar, for Czechoslovakia herself has always been a heavy exporter of beet sugar.

Most of all, people lament the loss of freedom in their letters to American friends: "There is work for everyone, but that is all we have. Nothing is as it used to be. We have only our memories." Families with young children are afraid to attend church in their hometown because their son and daughter would be barred from a higher school of learning and from a better job. The letters reflect the weariness, apathy, and despair of the writer.

American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. It would be simple for a daughter to send a warm sweater to her mother in Czechoslovakia who writes: "My room is unheated and it is so cold that I stay in bed and cry myself to sleep. A wool sweater is not to be had and a cotton sweater isn't worth anything." The Communists have made it impossible, however, for Americans to send gift packages by placing in 1961 an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty of 50 crowns on a kilo of used clothing (approximately $7 for 2.2 pounds; hourly wage of average officeworker is 6 crowns; of farmworker as little as 12 crowns a day).

The Red regime has a definite purpose in mind: to squeeze dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy Czechoslovak relatives, they must send dollars to the Red regime with which Czechoslovak citizens can then buy Czechoslovak goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

The Red regime then has dollars for anti-American propaganda and Communist subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. In view of these facts it is hard to understand why our Government is so careful to observe strictly all the niceties and why it has not restricted the Red government monopoly which bars American goods. After all, we are in a strong position for we have the dollars. We could insist, for instance, on gift packages of American goods (limited in size and value) if we continue to send dollars (unlimited, so far) and to travel to Czechoslovakia with unlimited spending money. In order to curtail the flow of American dollars abroad, the United States limits its citizens on how much they can bring back into this country duty free and exacts other limitations on its citizens as well. Why not set up reciprocity regulations or limitations when dealing with the Reds?

So far, Americans of Czechoslovakia have been asking this question in vain.

DISAGREEMENT ON MAJOR DEFENSE DECISIONS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this morning at the military posture hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I asked General Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff two questions.

I ask unanimous consent that those questions be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, 1963 DEFENSE POSTURE HEARINGS, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE

1. General Taylor, I would appreciate it if you would tell this committee on what major decisions of the Secretary of Defense—or the President—with respect to national defense and weapons systems, a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in disagreement with the Secretary of Defense or the President—or were at any time in disagreement with either of them—and the reasons for any such disagreement.

2. I was prepared to ask you many questions just as I directed many questions to the Secretary of Defense, but before coming to the hearing this morning I read the current issue of U.S. News & World Report—specifically the article entitled "'Whiz Kids' Versus Military Men: Who Is Shaping Defense?" at pages 46 and 47.

I would appreciate your reading that article if you have not already done so—and giving this committee in written form your appraisal of the article as to whether it is accurate or inaccurate—and if it is inaccurate in what specific respects—before these hearings are closed.

Mr. COOPER. 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EULOGIES OF DECEASED SENATORS ON MARCH 1

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that Friday, March 1, will be devoted to eulogies of our late departed colleagues, Senator Dworshak, Senator Kerr, and Senator Chavez. I ask unanimous consent that on that sad occasion there be a limitation of 1 hour on remarks, speeches, and eulogies on each of our departed colleagues.

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

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the time now under control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12 o'clock noon having arrived, the order of February 20 becomes effective; and debate on the so-called Clark amendments, as set forth in Senate Resolutions 91 to 93, to the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen resolution, Senate Resolution 90, will now proceed under a 2-hour limitation, in controlled time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to modify further Senate Resolution 90, by transposing to page 17, line 23, after the word "Operations," the following language, preceded and followed by a comma, beginning on line 25, namely: "as well as any Senator who is appointed temporarily to fill any vacancy arising out of this proviso."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with that modification, I wish to emphasize again and again the word "temporarily."

I also wish to make the following routine corrections in subsection numbers, due to arrangement of committees in alphabetical order, namely:

On page 6, in line 16 strike out "c" and insert "d". On page 15, in line 24, and on page 16, in line 5, strike out "n" and insert "o".

On page 17, in line 22, after "Sciences," strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or".

On page 4, in line 1, amend section "2" to read as follows:

2. The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally.

Strike out section "3.", and renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 4, in line 9, amend section "7." to read as follows:

Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modifications will be made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time required for it to be chargeable to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senate is under controlled time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under controlled time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is acting as floor leader for his amendments, I yield not to exceed 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, human life is too high a price to pay for the empty propaganda of the American Medical Association. I am certain that every Member of Congress will be as shocked as I have been over a tragedy which we might have prevented.

Shortly before Christmas, two older Americans, Henry and Irene Jaggi, committed suicide in Hallandale, Fla., because, according to an editorial I have in my hand, they were overwhelmed with hospital and medical expenses and could not see any way of coping with them.

This tragedy was the subject of a compassionate editorial in the Daytona Beach Sunday News Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

"SUFFICIENT UNTO THE DAY"

Shortly before the holiday which preceded the one the Christian world will observe Tuesday, there was an occurrence in Florida which put a pall of depression over the reason for thanksgiving.

In an apartment at Hallandale, north of Miami, a man and wife were found dead—her body sprawled across a bed, his found crouched on the floor, his hands still clasped around her lifeless feet.

His position indicated that in the last moment of their lives, he was trying to give her comfort and assurance.

The couple had comfort—material comfort—but they did not have assurance.

Otherwise, surely, they would not have entered into a suicide pact.

Their story is a harsh one to be telling in the Christmas season because Christmas is celebrated as a symbol of life, not death. It is a time of rejoicing, of forgetting care and sorrow momentarily, of bright lights and shining young faces.

But it is a story which needs to be told when it can be shocking—told now in order to get its message through before Congress reconvenes next month.

That Congress, yet an unknown quantity because it is a new one, could act at least to wipe out the cause for the Hallandale tragedy. At least, it should be used to offset the great pressure that is to be used by one organized group to prevent Congress from acting on the problem.

Why did the couple in Hallandale decide to quit this world via the medium of taking an overdose of sleeping pills?

They left notes which poignantly gave the reason, some stated, some read between the lines.

Beside the notes was a mass of accumulated doctor and hospital bills, some paid, some unpaid. In fact, the major paid ones among them were for the services of doctors; the biggest unpaid one was for the wife's most recent stay in a Fort Lauderdale hospital. Canceled checks also recorded payments for quantities of drugs used to ease the pain of illness.

The notes, addressed to their daughter, asked forgiveness for their act. But, the notes indicated, the step simply had to be taken because they could not meet those unpaid bills now, and they could not see their way to do it in the future and still pay for the other essentials of life.

Police didn't reveal whether the notes—from both the husband and the wife—also said they did not want to be a burden on their daughter and granddaughter, also an adult. Quite possibly the parents had rationalized their suicides thus, else they would have been living with their daughter now that her own child was grown and married.

As you can see, these people are a cause for the administration's projected medicare program—a plan that would take care of society's neglect of its nearly 17 million elderly people in their last days on earth. The Hallandale couple affords stark and dual evidence of the need to give the elderly help in their loneliness and despair.

Will it be done in 1963?

The question is necessary because just south of Hallandale lives Dr. Edward Annis, president now of the American Medical Association, and the organization's leading spokesman in opposition to such assistance—to any kind of medical help that would not include the purchase of private medical insurance.

AMA put on a big drive in November to defeat all candidates who indicated they might approve of medicare or were solidly for it. Mostly, the political campaign failed. Too many people have become weary of the kind of opposition being used by organized doctors, and they failed to heed the fear ridden arguments.

A postelection survey of the cause of failure led Annis to this explanation: "The siren songs of the politicans were more appealing than the voices of reason and experience." And: "Although the AMA's public relations reserves were substantial, they were not sufficient."

He addressed a meeting of the Public Relations Society of America in Boston last month, and he said AMA is planning a massive "public relations war" in advance of Congress being asked again to pass medicare as part of the social security program. So still more money will be poured into the coffers of AMA in order to have a "sufficient" amount with which to conduct a still more subtle war against "politicians."

(The Nation sorely needs more doctors to quicken the competition and to hold down their cost. But it also needs politicians—it is the politician who interests himself in government and keeps our free political system going. Would Dr. Annis dispense with them—or only those willing to bow to certain lobbying and pressure groups?)

Christians—in fact, all Floridians—can hope Dr. Annis stumbles across the story of the tragedy in Hallandale, and, pondering it, question whether he is giving AMA proper leadership.

Will he think of the couple's loneliness in those last hours of life, and wonder at the thoughts of the husband as he pressed his lips to the feet of his dying wife?

On Tuesday, particularly, we only can hope Dr. Annis may find a new definition of the word "sufficient" as he thinks of the debt-ridden couple who did not want to be a burden to the young, but whose hopes for future relief had been dashed by pressure on the last Congress by a special interest group.

Perhaps, then, Dr. Annis would use the word along these lines: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." And the new Congress would not feel the pressure from money spent on a public relations war to perpetuate a great social evil in America.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, a great nation cannot countenance such tragedies and retain its self-respect. We cannot delay any longer. We must enact, now, a program of hospital and related benefits under social security, a program such as would be provided under my bill, S. 65, or the administration's bill, S. 880, introduced last week by our colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time for the call of the roll be charged to both sides. If the sponsor of the amendments is not on the floor shortly, I shall have to ask, unfortunately, for a live quorum and give up a lot of my own time in the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I request that the Senator from Pennsylvania speak first and that I may be permitted to conclude this debate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, of course, that is the privilege of the majority leader. My understanding is that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate is to vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. How much time does the majority leader desire to speak at the end?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We each have 42½ minutes left, I believe, and I would like 42½ minutes, or 40 minutes, or even 35 minutes, in order that I may yield for questions. I would like all that time be-

cause I have some remarks to make. When I get through with them, I would like to yield for questions.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator desire to utilize the whole time himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will excuse me if I ruminate, will he not, because I had not anticipated this position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. While the Senator from Pennsylvania ruminates, I may state to him that, so far as the majority leader is concerned, it is not his intention to ask for a rollcall on any of the Clark resolutions in the nature of amendments or the resolution itself.

Mr. CLARK. I think the majority leader will understand what I have in mind when I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will it come out of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Pennsylvania suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to address a question to the able Senator from Pennsylvania before he suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator would like to have it come out of my time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It looks as if it is coming out of the time of both of us.

Mr. KUCHEL. Two or three of us are going to be absent who would like to be recorded if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote. Under those circumstances, on the vote, if the roll is to be called at 2 o'clock, I would like to have a little time.

Mr. CLARK. It was in order to accommodate to that situation, having come to the floor for the first time from an important committee meeting, that I wanted to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whose time is this coming out of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator from Montana have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 44 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that the resolution before the Senate is Senate Resolution 93, which would increase the membership of the Committee on Finance from 17 to 21. I rise in support of that resolution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The three amendments proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania are before the Senate, with the right of the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw any one or all of them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up Senate Resolution 93, dealing with the Committee on Finance, and I ask that the first vote be on that resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In Senate Resolution 90, on page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one."

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment carries with it also the implicit assumption that the membership of the committee will be composed of 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans, instead of the present composition of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The first argument for increasing the membership is that the membership of the various committees should reflect the approximate distribution of the parties in the Senate itself.

There are now 67 Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle and 33 on the Republican side of the aisle. Therefore the party ratio, as officially declared, is slightly in excess of 2 to 1. However, the composition of the Finance Committee under the proposal advanced by the Senator from Montana and the Democratic steering committee would not be 2 to 1, but 11 to 6. Therefore it seems to me that a very strong case can be made for enlarging the membership to 21, so that the parties may be represented on the committee in proportion to their membership on the floor of the Senate and that we may avoid having an even numbered committee, which may result in deadlocks; and, instead, produce an odd-numbered committee, so that the committee can come to definite decisions.

A little mental arithmetic shows that 14 to 7, with a total of 21, is the only figure which meets these two requirements.

Therefore, I believe a conclusive case can be made for enlarging the membership of the Finance Committee from 17 to 21.

Of course this is not all of the story. As I tried to point out in my remarks of last Thursday, in reality, there are in the Senate, not two political parties, but four. First, there are the liberal and progressive Democrats of the North and West, who try to be loyal to the national platform of the Democratic Party and to the general program of the President, although reserving the right to disagree on certain issues.

The second party is that of the conservative Democrats, who certainly disagree with the platform of the party on civil rights, and generally on economic and financial matters, as well.

The third political party is that of the conservative Republicans—they form the overwhelming mass of the Republican Party in both the Senate and House.

Finally, there is the small but gallant band of liberal Republicans.

These are the four political parties. I should think that certainly on the question of civil rights the liberal Democrats plus the liberal Republicans probably comprise a majority of the Senate, and I believe that on basic economic issues they also comprise a majority of the Senate.

But the Senate has been dominated for a great many years in the past by a coalition of the conservative Democrats and the conservative Republicans. This has been possible because of the very close cooperation between the two groups. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] brought out in his very able and commendable address of last week, the machinery of the Democratic Party in the Senate is almost entirely in the hands of the conservative Democrats.

The Committee on Finance will be perhaps the most important committee in the Senate during this Congress. Through it will pass the tax measures. Through it will pass proposals for hospital and medical care for the aged. These are the two most important issues at present scheduled for action.

I have been a member of the Committee on Finance for some 7 years. I have been treated with conspicuous courtesy and fairness by the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I have had pleasant associations with others upon that body. At times, our disputes became quite heated, but I have enjoyed my associations on that committee. I have appreciated the personal treatment which I have received.

However, it is an open secret that the Republicans on the Committee on Finance present a virtually solid front, and that on virtually every basic and fundamental issue enough of the Democrats side with the Republicans so that they hold a secure majority in the committee itself.

It is always ungracious to classify people. I do not like to be classified myself. I like to think that I judge individual issues on their merits. I certainly do not charge every member of the Committee on Finance with having fixed and unalterable opinions. There is always hope. But I think it is fair to say that of the present composition of the

committee, there are at a very minimum four Democratic votes which on virtually all occasions will side with the six Republicans. I may be wrong in that belief, but I think that is a conservative estimate, giving the benefit of the doubt to one or two individuals. So I should say that the vote on these basic matters of principle will be at least 10 to 7, possibly 11 to 6, and that on this decision really hangs whether the program of the President will be enacted.

We all know the prestige which a report from the committee has upon Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is always a given percentage of Senators who will accept the decisions of the majority of a committee, and those who oppose the decision of the committee start from an extremely disadvantageous position. So we face an issue not merely as to whether the composition of the committee is to conform to the party position of the Senate. The basic issue we face is whether the program of the National Democratic Party and of the President of the United States will be put into effect, or whether it will be smothered to death, asphyxiated, crippled, and enfeebled in the Committee on Finance. That is the issue; we cannot avoid it or disguise it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Democrat Joe," written by James Reston, and published in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin of February 24, 1963; an editorial entitled "Unrepresentative Senate," published in the Washington Post of February 20, 1963; and an editorial entitled "For History's Sake," published in the Washington Post of February 22, 1963.

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

[From the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Feb. 24, 1963]

DEMOCRAT JOE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—One of the most attractive things about Washington is that every once in a while somebody stands right up and tells the truth, just to see what will happen.

Take JOE CLARK. He's a Senator from Pennsylvania. As such, he's supposed to accept the rules of the club, respect the leaders of the Senate establishment, and defend the Senate as "the greatest deliberative body in the world."

But not JOE. He got right up in the Senate the other day and attacked the whole system. He even suggested that the Democrats in the Senate ought to introduce a little democracy into their proceedings, and what he said about "the establishment" was even more daring.

QUITE UNRESPONSIVE

"The Senate establishment, as I see it," said JOE, "is almost the antithesis of democracy. It is not selected by any democratic process. It appears to be quite unresponsive to the caucuses of the two parties, be they Republican or Democratic. It is what might be called a self-perpetuating oligarchy with mild, but only mild, overtones of plutocracy."

Of course, this is very largely true and it helps explain why President Kennedy won a victory in the Senate races last November but hasn't got anything out of the Senate since.

The facts are clear enough. In the last election, the Democrats increased their liberal wing in the Senate—NELSON, of Wisconson; MCGOVERN, of South Dakota; BAYH, of Indiana; KENNEDY, of Massachusetts—and now outnumber the Republicans, 68 to 32.

This was a net gain of four Democrats, and CLARK had the original idea that the liberal gains should be reflected in the Democratic steering committee, which has the immense power of recommending committee assignments for all Democratic Members of the Senate.

In 1961 and again at the start of the present 88th Congress in January, the Democratic Members of the Senate, meeting in conference, approved a statement by the Senate Democratic leader, Mike Mansfield, that "the composition of the Democratic steering committee should reflect both the geographical distribution and the ideological views of the Members of the Senate.

This, however, was not done.

CLARK estimates that there are 28 conservative Democrats and 40 liberal Democrats in the Senate, and that northern and western Democratic Senators outnumber southern Democratic Senators. But 7 of the 15 members of the powerful steering committee are southerners, and with the addition of 2 conservative Democratic members from elsewhere, the conservatives dominate the steering committee, 9–6.

Efforts to change this situation failed in a vote of all the Democratic Senators, and "they failed largely, I think," said CLARK, "because the leadership announced against it and spoke against it in conference and threw the full impact of its undoubted moral authority against what, to me, at least, seems to be this badly needed reform."

It is not hard to analyze why the liberal Democratic leaders, MANSFIELD and HUMPHREY, rejected the reform. Seven of the nine conservatives on the steering committee are also chairmen of other key Senate committees:

Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, is chairman of the District of Columbia Committee; Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, Agriculture and Forestry; Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, Appropriations; Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, Post Office and Civil Service; Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Government Operations; Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, Banking and Currency; and Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, Armed Services.

The other two conservatives on the steering committee are SMATHERS and HOLLAND, both of Florida.

CLARK didn't want to kick any of these eminent gentlemen off the steering committee; he just wanted to make the committee larger to get a better break for the northern liberals. But he was voted down and he's still growling.

He even went so far as to look into the committee assignments recommended by the steering committee, and came up with these interesting statistics: Of 8 nonfreshman Senators who voted against changing the present filibuster rule in the Senate, 6 were assigned to the Senate committee of their first choice, but of the 14 nonfreshman Senators who voted to liberalize the filibuster rule, only 1 got the committee of his choice.

PUT INTO THE RECORD

Of course, CLARK didn't say that the conservatives were being rewarded by the steering committee or the liberals punished, but all the same, he thought the figures were interesting enough to go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is what adds spice to the capital—somebody always fighting for lost causes.

Politics was first defined as "the art of preventing people from minding their own business" and then as "the art of forcing people to decide things they don't understand." JOE CLARK is less cynical. He persists in thinking that democracy should have a chance, even in the Democratic Party in the Senate.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

UNREPRESENTATIVE SENATE

Majority Leader MANSFIELD'S impatience over the continued wrangling in the Senate is quite understandable and will be widely shared. After 5 weeks of filibustering, maneuvering, and quarreling over committee assignments, the Senate ought to settle down to its legislative business. It would be a mistake, however, merely to sweep under the rug the deficiencies which Senator CLARK and some of his colleagues have brought to light.

No doubt the majority leader is right in saying that these weaknesses cannot be corrected now. Nevertheless, Senator CLARK has made a powerful case for changes in the Senate's control mechanism with the object of making it a more responsible legislative body. Despite the overwhelming preponderance of Democrats, and the liberal leanings of a substantial majority of them, the Senate is still dominated in large measure by a loose coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans. The liberals have not yet succeeded in making their influence felt in proportion to their numbers.

Mr. CLARK'S analysis of the situation in the Democratic steering committee was very enlightening. This 15-man leadership committee of the dominant party consists of seven members from the South, three from the Northeast, three from the Pacific, and Mountain States, and two from the Midwest. By Senator CLARK'S classification, nine of these steering committee members are conservatives and only six liberals who can be generally counted on to support measures sponsored by the Kennedy administration. Since there are about 40 "Kennedy Democrats" in the Senate, this makes the steering committee, which assigns Senators to all the legislative committees, highly unrepresentative of the Democratic Senate membership. "I suggest in all candor," Mr. CLARK said, "that * * * the present membership of the steering committee accordingly does not fairly represent either the geography or the ideology of the Democratic membership of the Senate."

The Senator's other prize example of the Senate's unresponsiveness to what happened at the polls last November is the Finance Committee. This most powerful committee of the Senate has 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans, a ratio slightly more favorable to the minority than is justified by its membership of 33 out of the 100 Senators. There is also a disproportionate number of southern Democrats on the committee. Mr. CLARK was not exaggerating when he charged that the Finance Committee lineup does not reflect the views of the entire Senate but rather those of the "well-known conservative bipartisan coalition opposed to the President of the United States."

It was for this reason that Senator CLARK proposed, and is still fighting for, the addition of two members to the Finance Committee. His proposal is entirely reasonable, but the cards are stacked against him. Apparently the only hope for achievement of the basic reforms that Mr. CLARK and his colleagues are seeking lies in the creation of a new committee or commission on the organization of Congress to make a detailed study aimed at moderation of both the Senate and the House. This is the project toward which the major efforts of the liberal forces should be directed.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

FOR HISTORY'S SAKE

In his major complaint over the obsolescence of the Senate's operations, Senator CLARK made a commendable effort to open some of that body's secret files. Why, he asked, should the minutes of the Senate's Democratic steering committee remain indefinitely under lock and key? Why should the members of even Senate staffs be denied access to the proceedings of the Democratic conferences? Senator CLARK made clear that he is advocating, not open meetings of the steering committee and the party conferences, but only a relatively mild relaxation of the present secrecy.

These records, the Senator rightly said, are a part of the history of our times. Mr. CLARK was especially perturbed because he had to go to the office of the secretary of the majority and get the books unlocked before he could read what happened in the days of Woodrow Wilson. Even the State Department discloses its confidential documents after a reasonable lapse of time. Certainly it would not be unreasonable for the congressional party groups which meet behind closed doors to open their records to the public as well as to senatorial staffs after a reasonable interval. Senator CLARK suggested from 3 months to a year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this has been a very interesting controversy over committee places, mainly because we have been engaged in an unusual review of the internal activities of the majority party. It is a fact that the total Senate must vote upon the number of places and upon the designations to these places, but this rarely is in practice too meaningful to Senators other than those of the majority, because the majority agrees and is then at one and can work its will. This is respected as normal party function.

However, we are confronted with an unusual situation, in which members of the majority have come forward with some very interesting revelations. The most interesting and important, so far as I am concerned, is the one relating to the factual analysis which, as the Senator from Pennsylvania points out, demonstrates that Senators who favored a rule XXII change—and that includes me—suffered the most seriously in the reshuffling of committee places, as compared with Senators who did not favor such a rules change.

I understand perfectly the attitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania in reading no motives into anything, because he has no evidence, beyond what he experienced in his party's deliberations, on which to do so. I naturally have even less than that, not having participated in those deliberations. Hence I have taken the position that these are the vicissitudes of political and public life. Although there were other ways to realine committees, those ways were not chosen. We cannot refrain from taking cognizance, first, of the fact that those who were in the rules fight suffered; and, second, of the natural feeling of confusion on the part of people in my State about what occurred. The Governor of my State issued a statement on February 15, commenting on this matter, setting forth how displeased the State was that one of its Senators was dropped from the Committee on Appropriations by virtue of the reduction in numbers in the Republican membership on the committee, and then stating:

I believe the people of New York State will join with me in protesting this arbitrary, politically motivated discrimination against them.

Under these circumstances, taking these two facts together, it seems to me that I must take my position with those who seek to change the conditions which brought about this situation, in which those who were advocating a rules change allegedly felt the heavy hand of adverse selection in their committee places, as compared with those who were not advocating a rules change. It seems to me that simply the spirit of cooperation with those who worked with me in the rules fight, which we considered to be in the Nation's interest, dictates that I stand together with those who would change those conditions.

Hence, I shall support the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself as much of the time remaining to me as I may require.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week I undertook to make my case on the floor of the Senate with respect to the need to change the size of three Senate committees, in order to enable Senators who support, in general, the program of the President, and who, in particular, were denied seats on these committees, to which, in my opinion, in equity and justice they were entitled, to join those committees.

I shall now very briefly summarize the case I attempted to make.

My proposal, which is pending, is to increase the size of the Finance Committee from 17—consisting of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans—to 21, 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans. I believe this change to be highly desirable, for three reasons:

First, to bring the ratio between the Republican members and the Democratic members more nearly into line with the more than 2-to-1 majority which the Democrats presently have in the Senate—that is to say, 67 Democratic Senators and 33 Republican Senators.

Mr. President, what valid excuse can there be for leaving the ratio on the Finance Committee 11 to 6, or substantially less than 2 to 1? This committee is one of the most important of the Senate's committees. It will have before it most important proposals recommended by the President. The committee presently is controlled—as was so well pointed out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—by a conservative coalition composed of southern Democratic Senators and western and northern Republican Senators, so that it does not represent the will of the majority of the Senate, nor will it, in my opinion, honest and able though each of these Senators is. I do not challenge the integrity of any Senator, nor do I challenge the sincerity of any Senator's economic views, but this committee does not represent the country or the majority of the Senate. For that reason, to maintain the present ratio with the present membership of that committee is, in my opinion, unsound and unwise.

My second reason is to make additional seats available to Senators who are entitled to them on the basis of their records in the Senate—whether by seniority or otherwise. Seniority was ignored nine times in the assignments made by members of the Democratic steering committee, who themselves rule by seniority. Yet, Mr. President, when it seemed to them desirable to ignore seniority, they did so.

I do not challenge the motivation or impugn the good faith of anyone. All I say is that those who live by seniority should be prepared to die by it, if as a result their own position is going to be adversely affected. I suggest they should allow others to live by the same rule which they have so often invoked in support of their own position.

Let me say that, on other occasions, the size of the Finance Committee has been substantially larger than it presently is—and, indeed, larger than my proposal would make it. As recently as 1937, the Finance Committee consisted of 21 members—in other words, the same size I now propose to make it. So in this body, so devoted to precedent, there is excellent precedent for changing the size of the Finance Committee.

My third reason is to open the committee's membership to Senators who will support the programs of the President, particularly his programs with respect to taxes and medicare. I believe the power of the Executive should be increased to the extent necessary to make it possible for the legislature to give the Executive fair consideration of all measures which the Executive sends to the legislature—in short, Mr. President, that, in effect, the President should be entitled to a hearing on all the bills he favors before the appropriate committees, and before committees which properly represent the membership of the Senate, and whose membership is not based solely and alone upon the power of such a coalition as that referred to to control these important committees.

The Senate establishment opposed this proposed change. If the Senate establishment wins—and I am under no illusion in regard to this matter—I submit that the present sterile, ultraconservative control of the Finance Committee will be continued, and that the programs of the President will be crippled, if not actually destroyed.

Mr. President, let me ask how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the great historian, Arnold J. Toynbee, in his massive study of history, has pointed out that a civilization advances when it is under the control of a creative minority, and that civilization decays when the minority—which to date has controlled

all civilizations, and, indeed, controls ours today—is not creative, but merely is dominant, when it supports the status quo, when it is intent only on preserving power, not on advancing a forward-looking civilization, which must advance with its time.

Mr. President, I submit that today there is in the Senate a creative majority which must sooner or later wrest control from the dominant minority, if the Senate is to play its proper constitutional part in our Government's efforts to keep America moving forward in a world of change and crisis. I submit that the Senate cannot afford to stand still while every other governmental institution in the world is moving ahead to meet the challenges of our time.

Something has been said about "packing" a committee. I have said before, and I repeat now, that neither I nor any of the Senators who support the position I take is attempting to engage in a "packing" movement. This is an effort to "unstack" the committee, which presently is "stacked" against the President's supporters in the Senate.

I hope Senators will vote against keeping the clock turned back to suit the wishes of a small minority which is out of touch with the facts of modern life.

Mr. President, this controversy may seem to some to be a mere haggle over procedure. But I submit that procedure is the heart of liberty and the heart of freedom; and I submit that until the Senate frees itself from the outmoded and archaic procedures under which it is governed, there can be little hope for the enactment of a meaningful legislative program.

I call the attention of Senators and the attention of the press and the attention of the public generally to what I regard as a very pertinent quotation from one who has thought deeply about the survival of Western civilization. I refer to Sir C. P. Snow, of England. In his brilliant Reed lecture entitled "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution," after expressing his grave concern that the Western democracies were not moving ahead fast enough to meet the challenges of our time—not fast enough to deal with the problem of nuclear warfare, and not fast enough to bridge the gap in their alliances and to move forward in the interest of freedom—he said:

> More often than I like, I am saddened by a historical myth. Whether the myth is good history or not, doesn't matter; it is pressing enough for me. I can't help thinking of the Venetian Republic in their last half-century. Like us, they had once been fabulously lucky. They had become rich, as we did, by accident. They had acquired immense political skill, just as we have. A good many of them were tough-minded, realistic, patriotic men. They knew, just as clearly as we know, that the current of history had begun to flow against them. Many of them gave their minds to working out ways to keep going. It would have meant breaking the pattern into which they had crystallised. They were fond of the pattern, just as we—
>
> In the Senate—
>
> are fond of ours. They never found the will to break it.

Mr. President, may the Senate find the will to break the pattern before it is too late.

I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the motion before the Senate to increase the size of the Committee on Finance. The majority leader has indicated that he does not desire a yea and nay vote on either the change that he has proposed in the rule or any of mine. Unless some other Senator forces it, I am not willing to put Senators into what essentially would be an embarrassing position. I know there is no chance of victory.

Mr. President, this is the first Battle of Bull Run. Those of us who wish to modernize the Senate and make it capable of performing its constitutional obligations in a time of great stress, in a time of constant change, and in a time of recurring crises, are going to get licked. But the fight will continue. It will continue until it is won.

The reception in the press and with the public has been far more favorable toward my efforts and those of my colleagues than is the case in the Senate. I shall continue to press, with those who desire to update and streamline the Senate, for the changes of the rules which are now pending in the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I now have the honor to serve. From time to time we shall bring before the Senate Senate Resolution 9 in order to shock the conscience of the Senate into a realization that it is unethical, wrong, and immoral to deny the right to vote to 56 Senators who desire to change our own rules.

Mr. President, the fight will go on, and one day it will be won.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has indicated that he will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I would ask the Senate to concur in that suggestion because I feel that the sooner we face the business now before the Senate and decide it one way or the other, the better off we shall be.

Let me say at the outset that the Senator from Pennsylvania has acted entirely within his rights in pursuing the matter which he has been discussing on the floor for the past week. He has been doing what any Senator may do and many have done when they are obsessed with one of the many issues which lie within the purview of the Senate.

I am sure the Senator's intentions are of the best and that there was no thought in his mind of attacking the Senator from Montana. Nevertheless, his remarks, in some respects, constitute a reflection direct or indirect on the caliber if not the intent of the leadership. For that, I bear him no rancor. He is entitled to his views. He is entitled to express them in caucus, on the floor of the Senate or wherever his discretion may lead him to express them.

Insofar as the Senator's remarks of the past week concern the rules of the Senate, I reiterate what I have said on a number of occasions: There is nothing sacrosanct in the rules. They are not beyond discussion or change. They have been changed before and, indeed, we are about to amend a rule, today, one way or another.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has performed a useful service by suggesting from time to time, in the past, reforms which he believes will render more efficient and more responsive the operation of the Senate. His election to the Rules Committee, which I was delighted to support in the steering committee, offers him an opportunity to pursue this matter in the most appropriate forum and I hope, most sincerely, that he will do so.

In fact, I know that he will. But the Senator's remarks in the past week were not primarily directed at the rules—the written rules—which however wise or foolish, however antiquated or modern, apply equally to all Members. To be sure, the Senator touched on these matters in passing, but only in passing. He aimed his fire at the organization of the democratic majority of which he is a member and he tilted his lance at something which he termed the "Senate establishment."

Since I do not know what the Senator from Pennsylvania means by the Senate establishment—although I followed his remarks most carefully—I can neither join him in criticism of it or rise to defend it. I can only say, as I have said many times, one Senator, one voice, one vote. We are all equal here, and insofar as the majority leader is concerned, he has operated in good conscience, under that principle. There is only one establishment in the Senate which the majority leadership seeks to foster. That is an establishment of 51 votes on behalf of the President's program. And whenever the Senator from Pennsylvania can assure him of 51 votes for that purpose, the Senator from Montana will be only too happy to support him for the presidency of the 51 club.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is within his rights when he tilts his lance and charges at the windmills of evil which he perceives in the Senate. But so, too, is the Senator from Montana when he objects to finding himself, his leadership and his party, at the end of the charge, impaled upon the point. For what is the burden of the Senator's attack if it is not his disapproval of his own party? If I interpret his remarks correctly, he makes two principal points:

First, that the organization of the Senate, which is controlled by the Democratic majority in the caucus, has been carried out in a deliberately inequitable, if not a vindictively inequitable, pattern against what he would term the liberal group of Democrats;

Second, that it would be feasible to organize the majority and the Senate in a pattern much more conducive to the passage of the President's program and that in failing to do so the leadership has failed the President.

May I say to the Senator that he is right on both counts and he is wrong, very wrong on both counts. Each Democratic Senator defines the needs of the Democratic Party in terms of his own dictionary. The Senator from Pennsylvania has his dictionary and according to his dictionary he is right. But I remind the Senator that he is not using the same book as the Senator from Mis-

souri or the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Georgia. Yet all are Democrats, and their States helped to elect a Democratic President. According to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the organization of the majority in the Senate is inequitable. According to these other Members it may also be inequitable in another way.

According to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the organization is equitable when he is elected to the Committee on Rules and Administration but it is inequitable when it does not place him on the Foreign Relations Committee. The organization is equitable when it places the majority leader or the whip on the Appropriations Committee but it is not equitable when it places the Senator from Alaska on the same committee.

The organization is not equitable when it does not change the total membership of the Foreign Relations. But it would be equitable if it added several members to the committee and, I presume, accommodated the wishes of the Senator from Pennsylvania as regards his membership on it. It is inequitable when it follows the principle of seniority or ignores the principle of seniority in an appointment of which the Senator does not approve. And it is equitable either way if the result is an appointment of which he does approve.

I would say to the Senator that the decisions in these matters are never easy. What is meat for one Senator is another's poison. But the decisions have to be made. In the last analysis, the responsibility rests with the conference to see that equity is done for the steering committee and the leadership are but its creatures.

May I say that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had every encouragement from the leadership and every opportunity to test his concepts of equity. His concepts have been rejected time and again, in the steering committee and by the conference.

That is not to say that the concepts are wrong in an historical sense. The Senator from Pennsylvania may have some mysterious wisdom which enables him to determine what is right for the Demorcatic Party—a wisdom which is denied to ordinary Democrats. But wise or not, his concepts of equity are clearly not applicable in this Senate of the 88th Congress, not because an establishment has ordained it but because the votes of his colleagues deny their applicability.

As for his concepts on committee reorganization, again I would point out that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had every opportunity to test his proposals time and again in caucus and in steering committee, and repeatedly they have been rejected.

Yet, one cannot study the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania without gaining the impression that he believes these tests were unfair to him, and, in particular, that the leadership was unfair. It is as though he believes that if the majority leader had but waved his baton in the direction of the good and the true according to the doctrine of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the results would have been different. The Senator from Montana has his views on the matters at issue. Sometimes they agree with those of the Senator from Pennsylvania and sometimes they do not.

But whether they agree or disagree, it would be well to get straight what is involved in the baton which rests in the hands of the majority leadership. I can assure the Senator that there is no magic in it. I cannot recall that the Senator from Pennsylvania once suggested strengthening this baton, in the steering committee or in the caucus. I cannot recall his proposing, for example, that the majority leader be assigned full authority for deciding the majority party position on organization or on committee assignments. Yet somehow he suggests that the majority leader has this authority in his baton. Well, Mr. President, what is the power in this baton that the majority leader is supposed to wave on organizations and assignments? In specifics, it is the power of appointment, after consultation with the other members of the leadership and with the concurrence of the caucus, to fill vacancies on the steering committee and the policy committee. It includes, too, one vote—I reiterate—one vote on each committee. That is all that there is in this baton in connection with the question at issue. How has the Senator from Montana used these great powers in his 2 years of tenure as majority leader?

He has used it to appoint the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the steering committee. I know these appointments pleased the Senator from Pennsylvania but I cannot in all honesty claim that I made them for that purpose. They were made solely for the purpose of carrying out the instructions of the conference to which the majority leader is answerable. But pleased though he may be with the appointments, still the Senator from Pennsylvania is not satisfied. What more would he have the Senator from Montana do? Since there are no mysterious powers of which I am aware in the leadership, what else is there for him to do? Would he have the majority leader make campaign speeches or deals for the doctrine according to the Senator from Pennsylvania? In the first place, the majority leader is not much of a speaker and not a dealer for any group in the Senate—neither for the old establishment or the Clark establishment. The Senator from Montana has a responsibility not only to the Senator from Pennsylvania but also to all the members of the Democratic conference, and he has a responsibility to the President as President and as head of the Democratic Party. The majority leader has to choose his own course and his own words in terms of what is feasible and fair to both responsibilities. He may make mistakes, and he does, mistakes of judgment—but he makes them not out of malice, not to support one establishment as against another, but solely within the framework of an effort to discharge his twin responsibilities to all Democrats and to the President, as best he knows how.

The Senator from Montana is by choice as well as necessity, a Democrat, nothing more, nothing less.

I, for one, do not think that a position of support for the President is maintained by depreciation of Democratic Members of the South or West, and the record of the 87th Congress bears this out. Let me go over a few of the key votes during that time, with an eye to what would have happened to that program if Senators from the South, and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON—whose names are frequently linked together—had voted against the measures concerned.

The 1-year emergency feed grains program, which carried 58 to 31, would have been defeated without 13 southerners and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON.

The Bush amendment to cut $150 million from NIH appropriations would have carried without 15 southerners and the 3 westerners.

The Scott substitute for the Area Redevelopment Act would have carried without 16 southerners and the 3 westerners.

On aid to education, the Goldwater loan substitute would have carried without 20 southerners and Senators HAYDEN, CANNON, and BIBLE. The authorization for the program by $252 million would have carried without them. The bill itself would have been defeated without eight southerners and the three westerners.

The Capehart amendment to cut the foreign aid development loan authority in half, which was defeated by a vote of 50 to 45, would have carried without 11 southerners and the westerners.

The Prouty amendment to require all economic aid projects to be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would have carried without 16 southerners and the westerners.

The Capehart amendment to cut public housing units to 37,000 would have passed without the votes of 11 southerners and Senators BIBLE and CANNON. His amendment to cut urban renewal by $700 million would be law today except for the votes of 10 southerners and the westerners.

The Prouty amendment to cut the term of the manpower retraining program, which was defeated 44 to 43, would have carried without 10 southerners and the westerners.

The first farm bill of 1962 was passed by a vote of 42 to 38. Without the aid of southerners and the westerners it would have been lost. The same is true of the second farm bill.

The standby Public Works Act of 1962 would have been defeated without the votes of nine southerners, and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON.

I must say that the approach of the Senator from Pennsylvania, insofar as it involves allegations of discrimination and the so-called Senate establishment, as distinct from his advocacy of rules changes which are certainly in order, have tended to be, in my opinion, both presumptuous and divisive. In my opinion, they have not helped the Democratic Party. In my opinion, they have not helped the President's program.

But leaving aside matters of opinion on which differences are to be expected, there are certain allegations of fact which the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised with regard to committee reconstitution and assignments and it is time to set them straight. For they have not come straight in either his remarks of the past few days or in the debate which accompanied them.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has presented three amendments to rule 25 which would, if adopted, increase the size of the Finance Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee. And the majority leader must and will oppose these amendments. In the eyes of the Senator from Pennsylvania this will undoubtedly constitute evidence that the majority leader is not only opposed to the President and the Democratic Party but is also a member in good standing in the establishment.

But the cruel facts of life concerning the Finance Committee are well known to the Senator. It is his contention that we should fly in the face of them. He knows that the Senator from Montana originally supported the increase, which in the first instance, as far as the Finance Committee was concerned, was initiated by the Senator from Pennsylvania. He knows the Senator from Montana sought an estimate of support in the Senate for it, and that his best information was that the move would fail by a substantial majority if it were contested, as it would be, on the Senate floor. He was told that Senators on the Finance Committee had promised that the President's tax bill would not be bottled up in committee.

I have informed the steering committee that the Senate would stay in session all this year and into next January 3, if need, so we will consider a tax bill on the floor of the Senate. And yet the Senator from Pennsylvania chose—as was his right—to make the fight in the steering committee; and having lost there by a vote of almost 3 to 1, he has chosen to prolong the matter by bringing it onto the Senate floor.

The Senator also knew that there was firm resistance to enlarging the Appropriations Committee on the part of the chairman. Already 27 Senators serve on the Appropriations Committee. The Senator would increase it to 29. His purpose, I believe, is to preserve for the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] a seat on the committee. No matter that many great and esteemed Members of this body in the past—liberal and conservative, northern and southern—lost their positions on the Appropriations Committee, when the power balance shifted in the Senate; the Senator from Pennsylvania insists that the present case is one in which vengeance was had upon the Senator from New York by the steering committee. That charge was not specifically made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, although the inference of his remarks was that a calculated job of "bumping" the Senator from New York had been done.

I have said on the floor that had the minority leader been prepared to favor enlarging the Finance Committee, the majority leader would have been prepared to support the enlargement of the Appropriations Committee so that the Senator from New York might have kept his seat. So if there has been any bumping, the responsibility does not rest on this side of the aisle.

Lastly, the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to make the Foreign Relations Committee a 21-man group, divided 14 and 7. I am at a loss to understand how this increase would serve the interest of a "bipartisan foreign policy" supporting the President, as the Senator contends, although it would offer our Republican friends the opportunity to place two additional members on the committee. I can understand the Senator's opinion that the addition of two Democrats, chosen from the "modern, forward-looking" segment of our party—as defined by the Senator from Pennsylvania—would benefit the committee and the country generally.

And now, since the Senator has to a considerable degree opened up the deliberations of the steering committee, I shall undertake a brief examination of the committee assignments we made. I may say that I was struck by the Senator's opinion that freshman Senators had been unduly favored over those of the class of 1958. We have indeed come full circle from the days when freshmen were given the leftovers after their seniors had feasted on the choice assignments. Now, we learn, we are force feeding them like prize livestock.

I think it is strange that the Senator, who received initial assignments to the Banking and Post Office and Civil Service Committees, and subsequently to the Labor Committee, on all of which his contributions to his State and country have been considered, should be exercised about freshman committee assignments.

But let us take up the nominations that seem to be most in controversy.

For the Aeronautics and Space Committee, the steering committee chose the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. The chairman of that committee during the 87th Congress was the former senior Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr. If geography should be a consideration in assigning Members, as the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks it should be, the steering committee acted wisely in choosing Mr. EDMONDSON to fill the vacancy. And, judging by his record as Governor of Oklahoma, no more wholehearted support of the President can be found in the Senate than Senator EDMONDSON.

May I say he was put on the second major committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because agriculture is, in his State, the No. 1 industry, because he is a rancher, because he knows farm problems, and because he is interested in agricultural legislation.

For the Armed Services Committee, Senator INOUYE was chosen. Mention has been made of the fact that Senator INOUYE voted against amending the cloture rule of the Senate, and consequently received choice committee assignments from his grateful colleagues. Oddly, the assignment of other freshman Senators, who received their choice of committees, and who voted 7 to 2 for liberalization of the cloture rule was not mentioned. And yet all but two of these nine Democratic Senators received at least one of the major committees of their choice, and most of them received both. Obviously an attack on the freshman committee assignments, based on the cloture vote, will not stand up in court—in any court. But little defense of the Inouye assignment is required. DAN INOUYE knows the military service as few men in the Senate can claim to know it. He knows military service in his body; and he knows it in his spirit. He knows what it means to fight for freedom even when freedom itself lapses into temporary injustice. Add to these considerations the fact that the State he represents is as heavily dominated by military problems as any other in the Union. Add to it, his experience in the House. If there is any decision of the steering committee which was wise and beyond reproach on any count, it is this one. And I salute him as the noblest American of us all.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN was assigned to the Agriculture Committee. The Senator from Pennsylvania spoke of "shanghaiing" members to serve on that committee. I can testify that if any "shanghaiing" was done, the Senator from South Dakota did it himself, and he did it with great vigor and determination.

He wrote to me and to other Senators immediately following his election and requested assignment to the committee having jurisdiction over his State's largest industry. I am glad to say he received it.

The nomination of Senator RIBICOFF to Finance meets the criteria of geography and experience and I trust no one will question his allegiance to the Democratic administration.

I cannot understand the criticism which the Senator from Pennsylvania has leveled at the practice of assigning new Members to at least one committee of their choice wherever possible or of the equity of the assignments which were made under the practice. The assignments have been equitable beyond any reasonable doubt and the practice itself has done an immense amount of good for the vitality of the Democratic Party in the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania or any other Member of the Senate can criticize until he is blue in the face, but I shall stand by this practice and the assignments which have been made under it in the present Congress.

But to proceed, Mr. President, to the other appointments by the steering committee, which have been criticized.

The Appropriations Committee assignment has excited some controversy. I am grateful that the steering committee gave me one of the available seats on the committee.

I wrote a letter to every member of the committee asking for his support. Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, was given the other assignment. This committee is perhaps the most heavily balanced on the southern side. Some suggestions were made that another southern or

southwestern Senator be named. On geographical terms, this made no sense. I voted for the Senator from Wisconsin to fill the vacancy. A majority of the steering committee chose the Senator from Alaska. It was a good choice. Neither of our new States has had representation on the Appropriations Committee, and it is about time that they were given such consideration.

The nomination of Senator SMATHERS, secretary of the Democratic conference, to the Foreign Relations Committee was based on seniority. Geographically, it was also a fact that the last four Senators to go on that committee were from the Midwest, the Far West, and the East. As a matter of fact, I should say the last five Senators, including the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Those who initiated this discussion suggest that the so-called Senate establishment is anticivil rights, against the change in the Senate rules, and rewards or punishes those Senators accordingly, by committee assignments, depending upon their position on rules or cloture votes.

On page 2842 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Senator from Pennsylvania inserted a list of 21 so-called preferred Senators, preferred because they hold 3 major committee assignments, allegedly bestowed by the so-called establishment.

Yet of this very list of establishment-favored Senators, a majority of Senators, 11, voted for cloture in the recent rules debate. What kind of pattern of bias does this fact indicate? I submit it indicates there is no pattern.

The charge is made that the establishment controls the steering committee, and prevented its enlargement to reflect the true desires of all Democratic Senators.

This is also quite patently untrue. The Democratic Senators voted on this question in the Democratic caucus by secret ballot at the suggestion of the majority leader, and they voted to keep the size of the committee as it was by over 2 to 1. Who is better able to reflect the true desires and philosophy of all the Democratic Senators than all the Democratic Senators? It seems to me the answer should be obvious. We must grant Senators at least the intelligence and integrity to vote their own convictions.

The Senator from Pennsylvania placed in the RECORD last Wednesday another table showing the assignments given Senators who supported the present cloture rule, and those who voted to liberalize it. The purpose of this table, it was said, was to enable Senators to determine whether a pattern of favoritism or discrimination emerged from the new assignments, based on the recent rules controversy. I shall not attempt to explain away each assignment—as Senators know that a group of 15 men may be guided by many considerations. But the following should be made a part of this RECORD, as to the treatment Senators have received during their tenure in the Senate at the hands of the steering committee.

Of those who voted to liberalize the cloture rule, Senator BURDICK asked for the Agriculture Committee when he came to the Senate, and received it. This time he asked for Judiciary; but the available seats were filled by Senators KENNEDY and BAYH.

Senator CLARK was elected to the Rules Committee; the majority leader, may I say, voted for him twice.

Senator ENGLE, when he first came to the Senate, requested Armed Services, and got it; he sits on the Commerce Committee. Senator BARTLETT, who came to the Senate with him, received the Appropriations seat this year.

Senator HART was originally assigned to Judiciary and Agriculture and has now relinquished the latter in favor of Commerce.

Senator LAUSCHE, who requested the Finance Committee vacancy, had received an assignment to Foreign Relations during his first term.

Senator LONG of Missouri applied for Finance and Appropriations. His first preference when he came, the Judiciary Committee, had been given to him.

Senator Moss requested Appropriations and Space; his first preference when he came, the Interior Committee, had been given to him.

Senator MUSKIE informed the leadership this year that he would be interested in moving to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The single vacancy on that committee went to Senator SMATHERS, although I voted for Senator PELL. I am happy to say, since I am speaking of the distinguished Senator from Maine, that he will be chairman of the legislative review committee for this year and the next.

Senator NEUBERGER was to have been assigned to the Interior Committee, but lost that seat upon Senator HAYDEN'S request for it.

Senator PELL was placed on the Government Operations Committee, to comply with the rule assuring each Senator two major committee assignments.

Senator PROXMIRE had received his choice of assignments within a year after coming to the Senate. I supported him for both Finance and Appropriations, to neither of which he was assigned.

Senator YARBOROUGH, a present member of the Commerce and Labor Committees, requested appropriations. I have described the circumstances which I believe brought about the nomination of Senator BARTLETT.

In three cases where Senators who supported the present cloture rule were given a major committee assignment—Senator CANNON on Commerce, Senator HAYDEN on Interior, and Senator JORDAN on Public Works—the Members affected were clearly entitled to a second major committee when the Rules Committee became a minor committee. In two other cases where Senators supporting the present cloture rule received their first choice of assignments—Senator MCGEE on Post Office and Civil Service, and Senator SMATHERS on Foreign Relations—they were the senior applicants for the vacancies.

So far as Post Office and Civil Service is concerned, there were only two vacancies on that committee. There were two applicants, and Senator MCGEE was one of the two applicants.

These, then, were the principal appointments of the steering committee. As I have said, the practice of assigning new Members to committees of their choice and the assignments thereunder were wise and any honest examination of them, it seems to me, reveals no pattern except a reasonable and equitable one, which is for the good of the Senate, for the good of the party, and for the good of the Members concerned.

As for the rest of the appointments, they are not perfect as each Member may interpret perfection. It might have been better in some eyes if I had not been appointed to the Appropriations Committee or the Senator from Pennsylvania to the Rules Committee or the Senator from Florida to the Foreign Relations Committee, and so on. Certainly I differed with some of the choices.

But I do not question the motives behind anyone's vote on the steering committee. I do not insist that I alone know what is good for the party, the Senate, the President's program, or the Nation.

It is never easy to balance such factors as geographic distribution, seniority, Member interest. There are bound to be disappointments and disagreements. But in the framework in which the steering committee functions I have no criticism of the results. The Members did a conscientious job, and there is no instance in which I do not wholeheartedly approve of the assignments which were finally made, even though I did not vote with the majority on all of the selections.

Now I have about done. I think it is time we got down to work. The Senator from Pennsylvania has had his day on this matter, I hope, for this session; he had two votes by the Democratic membership in the caucus on enlarging the steering committee, and several more in the steering committee itself. The judgment of the caucus and that of the steering committee was that his dissent, while courageous, was not well taken, under the circumstances.

I dislike bringing the names of Senators and the process of choices onto the Senate floor in patches and dribs and drabs. I would prefer to have this whole process of caucus and steering committee in the open if the alternative is the leak, the rumor, or the half-fact. What ought to be brought to the floor is legislation. The committees are waiting to organize and to hold hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of prospective committee activity.

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

STATEMENT OF PROSPECTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

Senate Agriculture has the omnibus farm message before it and had hoped to hold hearings on the dairy program the week of February 25; however, due to the delay in committee assignments, the committee has not yet had its organizational meeting.

Senator MORSE has announced he intends early hearings on the omnibus education bill now before Senate Labor Committee. The committee started hearings today on the youth employment bill; mental health bills and the general health bills are ready for hearings if and when the subcommittees are properly organized to function with full memberships.

Senate Banking has the all-important mass transit bill, the bill to revise the silver policy, and the measure to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank—due to expire—and would like to schedule hearings as soon as the committee can have its organizational meetings.

Senate Armed Services is holding briefings and hearings on military posture and procurement; in addition it has before it bills introduced by Senator RUSSELL to extend the Selective Service Act, due to expire, to increase the compensation of the military, to provide for the civil defense fallout shelter program—all ready for committee consideration.

Senate District of Columbia Committee, when properly organized, has the very important measure increasing the existing authorization governing appropriations to the District of Columbia—our Federal City.

Senate Public Works, when it has a chairman, would like to schedule hearings on the air and water pollution control bills, amendments to the highway program, and other measures.

Due to the emergent times, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings, briefings, has reported nominations, but it has numerous important bills before it affecting disarmament, the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, a Foreign Service bill, all waiting consideration of a properly organized committee.

Senate Interior Committee has held hearings and are ready for final action on the water resources research program, the outdoor recreational opportunities program—with hearings scheduled on the wilderness bill, the comprehensive water resources planning program.

The House will soon send over the temporary public debt increase for finance considerations. Senate Appropriations has scheduled hearings on our appropriation bills to begin early in March.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my opinion it is time for all Senators to begin their examinations of substantive measures. It is time for Democrats to get down to the work they were sent here to do. I know of no group of men better qualified to do it. We are a diverse, active, and aggressive party; there are many divisions of opinion among us; and the fact is that at no time in our history have we been able to make progress without reconciling ourselves to those differences and capitalizing on that which holds us together.

What I believe those who complain of an "establishment" are, in the final analysis, complaining against is the ever-present fact of frustration, the frustration of working in this body, the frustration of half a loaf, the frustration of compromise that of necessity is always with us. Who among us does not feel this heavy cloak of dissatisfaction? Less than absolute power to achieve one's will is the essence of frustration. Yet less than absolute power to achieve one's will is also an essential of democracy. The practice of democracy is therefore frustrating, and let us be sure that when it ceases to be so for any group or faction, at that same time there will also have ceased to be a democracy. That same principle pervades all we do here, and we should thank God it does.

Now let us begin the substantive debates of the 88th Congress. I urge the Senate to get off the business of the Senate and get on with the business of the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the rather extraordinary comments just made by the Senator from Montana, I wonder whether he would join with me in a unanimous consent request that I may have not more than 3 minutes in which to speak before the vote is taken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I so request.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—have the yeas and nays been ordered?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. We hope the yeas and nays will not be ordered. I hope that no Senator will ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This subject has been holding up the Senate for more than a week. It is certainly entitled to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that the yeas and nays have been ordered. I had hoped that the Senate might vote without having the yeas and nays; but the will of the Senate must be observed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for not more than 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to reply in detail to the Senator from Montana; I am content to rely upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for what I said and for what can be fairly implied from what I said.

There is no vindictiveness in my heart.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CLARK. There was no vindictiveness in my words. My effort has been, and will continue to be, to democratize the procedures of the Senate, so that the Senate can play its part in our constitutional framework of government in the modern world.

The majority leader is entitled to his opinion. He has stated it most forcefully. Senators who are interested can see my views set forth in the pages of the RECORD last Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Those purposes and the case I made in support of them can all be summarized in a quotation from a report.

I should like to conclude by saying that my purpose and that of the small band who followed me, and who have fired the first shot of what has now become the "First Battle of Bull Run," is a purpose which was well stated in a report of the Democratic steering committee made in March 13, 1913, just before the Senators of the Wilson administration organized the Senate of the United States so as to make possible the passage of legislative measures of the New Freedom. I quote:

> We propose that this great body shall be democratic, not only in name but in practical reality, and that the charge so often made that it is controlled by a few men through committee organization, and otherwise, shall no longer have any basis in fact.

Mr. President, that is my continuing purpose. So long as there is breath within me and I am a Member of the U.S. Senate, I shall fight that good fight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 minutes altogether.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I honor the Senator from Pennsylvania for the courage, tenacity, determination, and devotion he has shown. However, I only express the hope that some of the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate during the past week will not come back to haunt some of the Democrats who will be running for reelection next year. I think we ought, at least, to look after our own. I think we ought to use a little discretion. I think we ought to help our colleagues, no matter from what part of the country they come.

I have noted some of the statements made in the course of this debate, statements not made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in this instance, wherein civil rights and the oil depletion allowance are tied together. I think I have a pretty good record on civil rights. It is not a perfect one, but it is a fairly good one. So far as oil depletion allowances are concerned, I believe in the depreciation law, because I come from an oil-producing State.

Then I find a further statement, one which I shall quote this time:

> Sometimes, Mr. President, in my sardonic moments, I wonder whether this is also a part of the plan—to discredit the party, to defeat the Senators from the North and the Senators from the West who otherwise might threaten the supremacy of the bipartisan alliance, and then to emerge with an even tighter control over the Senate than before, with the bipartisan coalition swollen in numbers and the liberal opposition diminished.

This is something about which we Democrats had better do a little thinking, if we are going to come back in sizable numbers following the elections in the years ahead. So I plead with all Senators—not only with the Senator from Pennsylvania—to try to get together on

this side of the aisle and try to help one another—because from now on the races will be tough—to do what we can, instead of creating divisiveness within the party, to bring the party together and to bring about an amalgamation or amelioration of the views which divide us at this time. The old saying, "In unity there is strength," applies to all Democrats, and I hope the Democrats will live up to their responsibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator from Montana has quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although he did not state which Senator spoke the words he quoted, let me say that those words which he quoted were mine. I wondered then; I wonder now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois still adheres to his opinion, in connection with which he stated:

> Sometimes, Mr. President, in my sardonic moments, I wonder whether this is also a part of the plan—to discredit the party, to defeat the Senators from the North and the Senators from the West who otherwise might threaten the supremacy of the bipartisan alliance.

And so forth and so on.

Certainly the Democrats will not get very far, with such language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to Senate Resolution 90.

Mr. RUSSELL. Which one is it, Mr. President? There are three of them. Are they to be voted on en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as found in the language of Senate Resolution 93.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to Senate Resolution 90. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the distinguished occupant of the chair state the resolution or motion now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The effect of the pending amendment is to strike out "17" and insert "21", as the membership of the Committee on Finance.

On the question of agreeing to this amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been previously announced by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Anderson	Hart	Nelson
Burdick	Javits	Pell
Case	Keating	Proxmire
Clark	McNamara	Yarborough
Douglas	Morse	Young, Ohio
Engle	Moss	

NAYS—68

Aiken	Dodd	Hruska
Allott	Dominick	Humphrey
Bartlett	Eastland	Inouye
Bayh	Edmondson	Jackson
Beall	Ellender	Johnston
Bennett	Ervin	Jordan, N.C.
Bible	Fong	Jordan, Idaho
Brewster	Fulbright	Kennedy
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Kuchel
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Lausche
Carlson	Hayden	Long, Mo.
Cooper	Hickenlooper	Long, La.
Curtis	Hill	Mansfield
Dirksen	Holland	McClellan
McGovern	Pearson	Sparkman
McIntyre	Prouty	Stennis
Mechem	Ribicoff	Symington
Metcalf	Robertson	Talmadge
Miller	Russell	Thurmond
Monroney	Scott	Tower
Morton	Simpson	Williams, N.J.
Mundt	Smathers	Young, N Dak.
Pastore	Smith	

NOT VOTING—15

Boggs	Gruening	Muskie
Cannon	Kefauver	Neuberger
Church	Magnuson	Randolph
Cotton	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Gore	McGee	Williams, Del.

So Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment embodied in Senate Resolution 91, which would increase the membership of the Committee on Appropriations by two.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In paragraph (b) (dealing with the Committee on Appropriations) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, it is proposed to strike out the word "twenty-seven" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-nine".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, which would have the effect of increasing the membership of the Appropriations Committee by two members. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, no debate is in order. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withold my vote.

Mr. MCNAMARA (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been previously announced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been previously announced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 70, as follows:

[No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Case	Keating	Neuberger
Clark	Morse	Proxmire
Douglas	Moss	Scott
Engle	Nelson	Yarborough

NAYS—70

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Hartke	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bayh	Hill	Pearson
Beall	Holland	Pell
Bennett	Hruska	Prouty
Bible	Humphrey	Ribicoff
Brewster	Inouye	Robertson
Burdick	Jackson	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Simpson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Cooper	Kennedy	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Lausche	Symington
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Dominick	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Tower
Edmondson	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Mechem	Young, Ohio
Fong	Metcalf	
Fulbright	Miller	

NOT VOTING—18

Boggs	Hart	McGee
Cannon	Javits	McNamara
Church	Kefauver	Muskie
Cotton	Magnuson	Randolph
Gore	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Gruening	McCarthy	Williams, Del.

So Mr. CLARK'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, pursuant to the authority vested in the unanimous-consent agreement, I withdraw Senate Resolution 92 from consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The question recurs on agreeing to the pending resolution, as modified.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 90, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page 10 of Senate Resolution 90, under "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs," line 25, item No. 7, the following is stated:

Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

I move that the words "Hawaii, Alaska, and" at the bottom of page 10 be deleted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution, as modified and amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), as modified and amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolutions 91, 92, and 93, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], now on the table, increasing the membership of certain mittees, be postponed indefinitely.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that Senate Resolutions 91 and 93 were defeated, and that Senate Resolution 92 was withdrawn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They were defeated as amendments to Senate Resolution 90, but they are still on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit a resolution containing a list of both the majority and minority members of the standing committees of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the majority and minority members on standing committees of the Senate shall be:

MAJORITY MEMBERS

AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. Anderson, chairman; Mr. Russell, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Edmondson.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. Ellender, chairman; Mr. Johnston, Mr. Holland, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Jordan, Mr. McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Edmondson.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Hayden, chairman; Mr. Russell, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. McGee, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Bartlett.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Russell, chairman; Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Engle, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Young of Ohio, and Mr. Inouye.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Robertson, chairman; Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Clark, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. McIntyre.

COMMERCE

Mr. Magnuson, chairman; Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hartke, Mr. McGee, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Cannon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Bible, chairman; Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. McIntyre.

FINANCE

Mr. Byrd of Virginia, chairman; Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Fulbright, and Mr. Ribicoff.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. Fulbright, chairman; Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Morse, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Gore, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Church, Mr. Symington, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Smathers.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McClellan, chairman; Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pell, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Brewster.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Jackson, chairman; Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Church, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Hayden, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Nelson.

JUDICIARY

Mr. Eastland, chairman; Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Bayh.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Hill, chairman; Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Kennedy.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Johnston, chairman; Mr. Monroney, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Brewster.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNamara, chairman; Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Bayh, and Mr. Nelson.

RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Jordan, chairman; Mr. Hayden, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Pell, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

MINORITY MEMBERS

AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mrs. Smith, Mr. Case, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Keating.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. Aiken, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Boggs, and Mr. Mechem.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Allott, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Case.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Beall, Mr. Goldwater, and Mr. Case.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Bennett, Mr. Tower, Mr. Javits, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Dominick.

COMMERCE

Mr. Cotton, Mr. Morton, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Beall.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Beall, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Dominick.

FINANCE

Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Dirksen.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Mundt.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. Mundt, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Javits, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Pearson.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Allott, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Mechem, and Mr. Dominick.

JUDICIARY

Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Keating, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Scott.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Javits, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Jordan of Idaho.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Carlson, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Boggs.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Cooper, Mr. Fong, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Pearson.

RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Curtis, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Scott.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution containing the membership of the committees.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) was agreed to.

MEMBERSHIP OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit a resolution containing the majority and minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the following be members of the Select Committee on Small Business:

Mr. Sparkman (chairman), Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Morse, Mr. Bible, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, Mr. Moss, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Javits, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Cotton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was considered and agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EULOGIES ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after discussion with the distinguished minority leader, I should like to announce—and this will cause some difficulties—that the Senate will meet next Friday to do honor to three of our departed colleagues, the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. Dworshak, the late Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, and the late Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez. It has been agreed that not more than 1 hour will be allocated to eulogies and speeches for each of those Senators. So I hope that on Friday next, March 1, which is the date agreeable to Mrs. Kerr, Mrs. Chavez, and Mrs. Dworshak, the Senate will meet to do honor to those three former colleagues of ours, who contributed so much to the welfare of their States and the country.

CATTLE PRICES AND AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, complaints are coming in about cattle prices, as well as many other agricultural prices. These complaints are based not only on present prices, with their recent declines, but they involve the prospect as to future agricultural prices.

Agriculture is facing serious trouble because of the lack of realism and clear thinking on the part of the Government and because of unsound policies being followed with respect to world trade. Agriculture suffers also because it does not have a champion in the Department of Agriculture. Too many of the Department of Agriculture's decisions are based upon erroneous State Department policies and a political eye is focused upon the heavy consumer vote in our cities. Added to all of this are a few people in the Agriculture Department whose first love is a desire to change our traditional agricultural economic system and impose more paternalism. As a result, there has been no dynamic leadership exerted in behalf of the families who live on our farms and whose sole business is agriculture.

Mr. Dave Grasmick, a qualified radio commentator in the field of agriculture in the Middle West writes me as follows:

In the past year, if you will check the records, you will find that our import over export of meat products will be roughly 4½ to 5 percent. If the United States were called upon to produce this extra 4½ to 5 percent import of meat over export, it would require 44,600,000 acres of American production of grass and feed crops to produce that extra 4½ to 5 percent of meat imported over export.

In the meantime our Federal Government tells us farmers that it has become necessary to retire 50 million acres of food production to bring production in balance with consumption. And here, and here alone, on this extra meat tonnage, we would have an opportunity to set aside—or utilize rather—44,600,000 acres to produce the extra 4½ to 5 percent of meat which is imported over our exports.

I have always spoken out in behalf of the European Common Market. I believe it is an excellent thing for Europe. It will bring political unity. It will be a bulwark against communism and it is based upon private enterprise. I do not believe that the trade policies of the United States are based upon an adequate understanding of what the Common Market really is. People have been told that it is a free trade movement. It is not; it is a protectionist movement. It involves the same principles as were followed by the United States in the founding of our Republic and which gave us a strong economy.

When the trade bill was before the Senate, I supported a number of agricultural amendments that would have been helpful to the American farmer. They were all defeated primarily because of administration opposition. I offered one amendment which would have provided a guideline for our negotiators. It would have set as a goal the holding of agricultural imports to not to exceed the 1957 level.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Mr. Eldon Griffiths which appeared in the Washington Post on February 23, 1963. It was written from Topeka, Kans.

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

TRANSATLANTIC FARM WAR

(By Eldon Griffiths)

TOPEKA, KANS.—It was the biggest thing in sight on the flat Kansas horizon, a gargantuan building the size of the *Queen Mary*. At first sight it looked like a cathedral, and in a sense it was. With its half dozen tall towers strapped together by soaring walls and concrete buttresses, the building was an American cathedral of plenty—one of those huge grain elevators used to store the surplus grain of the Middle West.

All told, America's elevators contain just under $5 billion of grain that the Nation cannot eat or feed to its animals. Simply to keep it from spoiling costs the taxpayer $1.4 million a day. Yet in spite of every effort to cut down farm acreages and sell—or give away—the surplus food, America's farmers are in danger of being drowned in a flood of their own golden grain.

Another big concrete building I visited last month in Rotterdam gave proof that this danger is growing. This was the headquarters of a Dutch firm that specializes in scalding the holds of oil tankers so as to make them clean enough to carry grain. Given the recent slump in tanker earnings it had become highly profitable to transform surplus tankers into bulk grain carriers for the North Atlantic trade.

Today, however, the Dutch firm is running into trouble. Its owners, looking ahead, have concluded that the mass transport of American grain to Europe is likely to fall

off rapidly as European output increases. French wheat farmers in particular are expanding their production by consolidating tiny peasant holdings into factory farms big enough to use the same multiple plows and combine harvesters one sees in the Middle West. And French President Charles de Gaulle is determined to help them by insuring that the Common Market's external tariff wall is used to keep out competing grain from the prairies of America and the Commonwealth lands, leaving French agriculture the master of Europe.

De Gaulle's drive to restore French farming to the position it held before the First World War—as Europe's granary—is easy to understand. But in the process America's farmers, not to speak of those in Argentina and the Commonwealth lands, are going to get hurt. For if France, with the support of the West German farming lobby, succeeds in maintaining high Common Market tariffs against oversea farm products, the United States alone stands to lose more than 30 percent of all its exports to Europe.

This figure is taken from a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The report predicts that between now and the late 1960's the U.S. wheat farmers will suffer the complete loss of their European market, that U.S. exports of oats, barley, sorghum, and rye will level off, then drop sharply, and that in the long run the whole of the European market for imported meat and poultry will be lost by the United States.

What these losses are likely to mean to the U.S. balance of payments is not hard to see. Farm sales now account for 32.4 percent of all U.S. exports to Europe, and if only half of them are lost, Washington will find that its presently favorable balance of trade with Europe is rapidly turned into deficit. Pressure on U.S. currency reserves inevitably would increase. The stability of the dollar once again might be called into question.

The more immediate—and noisier—result of the Common Market's closing its doors to American farm products would be a howl of rage from the farmers. Middle western farmers, already had been pressing to keep up the payments on their farm mortgages, their air-conditioning units, their TV sets, and their cars, are apt to reach for their political pitchforks if they see their incomes shrinking because of Europe's tariff walls. The farmers' attitude is that the United States "liberated Europe" in 1945, "fed Europe" under the Marshall plan, and "defended Europe" under NATO. If Europe now responds by shutting out U.S. products—"the height of rank ingratitude," as the farmers see it—the United States will have no alternative but to close the American market to European products, e.g., French wines and Volkswagens.

Unfortunately for its farmers, the United States is not well placed to get tough with the Common Market on the economic front. America sells to Europe not only more farm products but more industrial goods than Europe sells the United States. A tariff war might well hurt America more than Europe.

The administration may therefore be driven to protect its balance of payments—as well as its political rear in the key farm States—by cutbacks in other fields. For the American farmer, quite likely with the support of many of his urban compatriots, is determined that Europe shall not have it both ways. No longer can Europe expect the United States to go on spending tens of billions to defend it if Europe—led by France—moves toward an autarchy that excludes cheaper, better, and more plentiful American grain.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, great opportunities for the use of our agricultural products in industry are available. It cannot be brought about without a sincere, dynamic, and determined effort on the part of the Government. The recommendations of the bipartisan Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, to recommend new industrial uses for farm surpluses, has never received sympathetic effort toward its implementation by the Washington bureaucracy. At another time I expect to speak at some length on the question of industrial uses.

There is one other matter that I would like to mention in reference to farm prices and especially in reference to prices of cattle and hogs. Today the largest buyers of meat are our chain grocery stores. Their economic power exceeds the power of cattlemen, feeders, farmers generally, and the packing industry combined.

I am reliably told that meat buyers for large chain grocery concerns approach packing companies, both large and small, and inform them how much they will pay for meat. The question is not asked, what is the seller's price. If the price offered by the chains does not appeal to the packer, the potential buyer merely walks out and the chainstore features something else as its leader in the retail business. This in turn, forces the packers to beat down the price to the farmers, ranchers, and feeders, or the business will be lost to imports or other protein products.

What I have said about the power of chainstores in the buying market for meat has been reported to me, not by one or two sources, but by many sources over a period of many months. It is not a charge made by radical individuals or radical groups. It is an opinion held by many well-qualified conservative individuals who know the picture and have the interests of agriculture at heart.

It might be well for the Congress to investigate the marketing of meat and the impact of the chainstores on the same. It would be interesting to know what the Department of Agriculture is doing about it. Thousands of our farm families would welcome such an investigation.

BUREAUCRATIC TYRANNY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the very essence of the liberty which we not only highly prize, but which has built for us a strong economy and a strong Nation, is the right of choice. Individual citizens have the right to choose. They have the right to choose with whom they will affiliate, where they live, where and how they worship, where they spend their money, and where they want to work.

Our workers should have a right to choose whether or not they have a union and have that union represent them in bargaining. If their right to decide whether or not they want a union at all is in any way infringed or hampered, unionism then becomes compulsory.

Government should not be antiunion or prounion. Government should not be antimanagement or promanagement. Government should protect the rights of all and the right of the individual to make choices.

This philosophy is totally alien to the National Mediation Board. Its action in regard to the proposed organizing of United Air Lines employees amounts to nothing less than tyranny. The Board proceeds from a paternalistic notion that it is duty bound to so conduct its proceedings as to give the United Air Line workers what the Board thinks is good for them.

In this United Air Lines case the Board is denying the men and women involved as employees of United Air Lines the right to make a clear and understandable choice as to whether or not they want a union as their bargaining agent. The law places no such mandate on the National Mediation Board. It is a usurpation of power and it not only violates American tradition and principles, but it is grossly unfair. The Board proposes to force these workers to decide between two unions which are anxious for the business of serving as bargaining agents for the employees in question. The proposed ballot does not give any clear and understandable opportunity for the employees to first decide whether or not they want to organize.

These workers in question should have an opportunity to vote in two elections. The first one would be a sort of a primary election. It would decide whether or not they want a union. If a majority want a union, then there should be a subsequent election so that they could express their right of choice as to what union they wanted. I hope that the Board will reverse its position, abandon its tyrannical procedure, and preserve the right of choice for these splendid American citizens involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article which appeared in the Omaha World Herald on February 15, 1963, entitled "No-Union Vote Space is Asked," and also a brief editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 21, 1963, entitled "Land of Opportunity."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 21, 1963]

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

Cleaning women in the employ of United Air Lines learned the other day that America is, indeed, still the Land of Opportunity. The opportunity is being provided by the National Mediation Board, which ruled that the women, along with a wide assortment of United's ticket agents, clerical, and passenger service employees, may vote to join one of two unions, the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks or the International Association of Machinists.

There's a catch, to be sure. As United noted when it appealed to a court to prevent the vote, the employees won't have a chance to vote for no union at all. In other words, they'll have to give up a little freedom. But all that aside, where else could Cinderella be magically transformed into a railway clerk, not to mention a machinist?

[From the Omaha World-Herald Feb. 15, 1963]

"NO UNION" VOTE SPACE IS ASKED

WASHINGTON.—A group of nonunion United Air Lines employees asked Thursday to be given a chance to stay that way.

In a unique petition to the National Mediation Board, the group requested that a no-union vote space be placed on the ballot in a coming union representation election involving 13 thousand workers.

"We are not antiunion, but we are happy the way we are," said Donald McIntosh, a passenger agent in Chicago. "If a union becomes our bargaining agent we will no longer be on a merit system for pay raises."

Backing Mr. McIntosh was James K. Lamona, a San Francisco passenger agent, who gave this explanation for the move:

"We feel we can plead our own case individually—with the management—rather than through collective bargaining."

IF GEORGE WASHINGTON WERE ALIVE TODAY

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last Friday it was my high honor and privilege to read George Washington's Farewell Address on the floor of the Senate. Many persons have asked me what would be our first President's reaction to the problems posed in his Farewell Address if he were alive today.

Any answer, of course, must be in the realm of conjecture. But, in my opinion, logic would suggest that if Washington were President in this year of our Lord 1963, he would:

First. Be steadfast in his devotion to the principles inherent in our Constitution.

Second. Vigorously oppose various pressure groups whose chief objectives are to secure for themselves certain advantages and emoluments which may be detrimental to the general welfare.

Third. Insist on sound fiscal policies, knowing full well that failure to implement these could result in the destruction of everything Americans hold precious and dear, including liberty itself.

Fourth. Bitterly condemn any suggestion that the President should constantly seek more and more power for himself under the guise that this would be in the national interest.

Fifth. Recognize that in today's world the luxury of isolationism which we as a nation enjoyed for many years is no longer possible, but fully comprehend that in formulating our relations with other nations the question must always be asked: Is this in the best interest of the United States of America?

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, each Sunday morning I look forward to reading "Spires of the Spirit" from the gifted pen of the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and carried in the Washington Star. The Spires are always informative, eloquent, and challenging. The Spires in yesterday's Star beautifully and inspiringly told the story of Constantino Brumidi who is most appropriately acclaimed as the Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol. I ask unanimous consent that yesterday's Spires so truly captioned Walls That Speak may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From "Spires of the Spirit," by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate]

WALLS THAT SPEAK

Many years ago from the land of Mona Lisa an Italian immigrant came to the United States. For him freedom beckoned in this blessed land of room enough. His name was Brumidi (pronounced Brew-meed-dee). He was nearly 50 years of age. For years he had steeped himself in the mural glories of the Vatican and had helped to restore the faded Raphael frescos.

With that background he yearned, somehow with his art, to express his growing gratitude for the vast benefits he found waiting in his adopted land. He had personally felt the spell of the miracle of form and color which comes to pass when, as one has put it, "there is a lump of greasy pigment at the end of Michelangelo's bristle brush and by the time it has been laid on the stucco there is something there all men with eyes recognize as divine." This artist immigrant had as his ruling passion the humble desire to express the divine that for him with his brush glimmered through the greasy pigment, the hog bristle and the stucco.

Once in America his gifted brush and soaring imagination were dedicated to sacred subjects. He was asked to paint altar pieces of the crucifixion in New York and Philadelphia churches. During a visit south of the border he tried his skill at beautifying a cathedral in Mexico. Shortly after he was given his great chance when he was commissioned to embellish the expanding Capitol of the United States. This opportunity thrilled him. His toiling hands began their long tryst with beauty before Lincoln entered the White House to face the heartbreaking task of saving the Union. When a tragic accident, as he fell from the dome of the rotunda, snatched him from his unfinished task and sentenced him to end his life as an invalid, Hayes had succeeded Grant as President of the Republic.

Wherever Brumidi toiled in the vast Capitol the walls began to speak. In spite of detracting criticism and a lack of appreciation he kept patiently at his task for almost a quarter of a century. At 72 this neglected and unapplauded master of paint and fresco closed his weary and saddened eyes and was buried in an unmarked grave in the Capital City he adored. Less than a week after his death a prophecy was uttered on the floor of the U.S. Senate, "One day Brumidi will be crowned by the gratitude of succeeding generations." But, alas, the long years passed and a preoccupied Government allowed his memory to gather dust on the high shelves of oblivion.

This was in spite of the fact that it is no exaggeration to say that this adopted son of America is worthy to be acclaimed, as he is today, as the Michelangelo of the monumental edifice which is the shrine of each patriot's devotion. Millions of pilgrims, from all parts of the Nation and the globe, now gaze with admiration on the speaking walls where Constantino Brumidi breathed on them the haunting beauty that burned in his poetic soul. His loving signature to his grateful I O U for his loved America is written in heroic depictions, in human portraits, and for good measure in romantic landscaped etchings, as well as in birds and flowers and fruits. Out of his artistic cornucopia, across the years as he kept patiently on, came varied forms and figures clinging to the walls and ceilings in gorgeous colors and rich designs.

Perhaps the climax of all his Capitol treasures is what is known as the President's Room on the Senate side. For more than 6 years he toiled terribly on that jeweled ceiling from which human eyes follow one in all parts of the room. But the bequest he left there has given it the distinction of being called the most exquisitely decorated room in America.

Republics are notoriously ungrateful. It seems to be an unfortunate trait of democracy that often its most shining servants and saints are those who are cannonaded while alive and canonized only long after death has removed them beyond the reach of praise and blame.

At long last it was a determined woman, her great heart shamed by such flagrant ingratitude, who was destined to lift Brumidi to his rightful niche in the Westminster Abbey of our Nation's remembrance. That elect woman, Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, is the cultured wife of a former congressional legislator. By persistent research and the gathering of historical facts she burnished anew the annals of this immigrant's inspiring achievements. In her beautifully adorned volume, "Constantino Brumidi, Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," a lovely example of the bookmaker's art, she has reproduced in glorious colors the immortal frescos for all to see and admire. This that she has done deserves to be told in all the land now that largely through her efforts Brumidi has come into his own.

At a great gathering in the rotunda almost a dozen years ago, in the presence of an admiring throng, there was dramatically lifted up the artist's worn copy of the Bible. In it the hand that adorned the Capitol has entered the date of his arrival on the shores of this new sweet land of liberty as he fled from the thraldom of the old. In the sacred book he had inscribed, "Presented to me by the American Bible Society." It was in the inspiration from that Book of Books that he put upon the walls of the historic Capitol his offering to the God of Liberty and of Beauty from whom his genius was a golden gift. With what moving emotion this Italian refugee declared, "My daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country in the world in which there is liberty." In the beauty of those speaking walls Brumidi still lives.

Under the white dome on a mammoth mural in simple eloquence, with his brush, he signed himself in this opulent manner, "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

THE PROGRESS OF AGRICULTURE UNDER THIS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently there has been some pessimism with respect to the progress of the farm program under this administration. A survey I have just made does not justify this pessimism. In that regard, the following facts are of interest:

FARM INCOME

In 1961 farm income was $12.8 billion. In 1962 farm income was $12.9 billion. The 1962 farm income is 10 percent higher than 1960, and the highest since 1953.

AVERAGE FARM INCOME

Average farm income is up 18 percent from 1960. In 1960 it was $2,960; in 1961 it was $3,360; and in 1962 it was $3,500.

HOURLY FARM INCOME

In 1960 it was 87½ cents; in 1961 it was $1.05; and in 1962 it was $1.05.

BUSINESS ACTIVITY IN FARM STATES

Bank deposits and business activity in 20 major farm States are 41.6 percent above that of 1960.

The following facts are also of interest:

The 1961 and 1962 programs will cut feed grain surpluses 28 percent. Note, the 1962 crop year ends October 1, 1963.

The 1961 program reduced corn surpluses 368 million bushels, and the 1962 program is reducing corn surpluses 340 million bushels.

The wheat programs enacted will reduce wheat surpluses to their lowest level since 1957.

Further, as a result of these programs the cost of storing and handling wheat has been cut approximately $215 million.

Feed grain stocks can be reduced to needed reserve levels by 1965.

In wheat stocks, 1,400 million bushels can be cut in half by the midsixties.

In summary, Mr. President, it is clear that under this administration the American farmer is making steady and significant progress, and I believe the American people will be interested in the above facts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator say how much interest income has increased over 1960?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; I did not refer to that. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to insert that figure, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thought perhaps the Senator from Missouri referred to that point. It is my impression that interest income is far greater than it was in 1960.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

CASTRO-COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—COMMUNIST ATTACKS ON VENEZUELA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is important for us and for all citizens to give our attention not just to headlines about developments in Cuba, but to the problems, challenges and opportunities of the whole Caribbean and Latin American areas.

This past weekend, at a United Jewish Appeal dinner in Palm Springs, Calif., I spoke on some of the continuing problems and challenges relating to the security and progress of the Western Hemisphere and in particular, the countries of Latin America.

I ask that excerpts of my address, titled "Castro-Communist Subversion and the Alliance for Progress," be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with a statement I issued to the press on February 18, titled, "HUMPHREY Warns of Communist Attacks on Venezuela."

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO-COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United Jewish Appeal dinner, Palm Springs, Calif., February 23, 1963)

Tonight I wish to speak to you about an area of the world which now demands much of my attention as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and which should command your attention as interested citizens.

I speak of Latin America, which for so many decades was given low priority by our Government, and thought of in terms of a "land of mañana"—"tomorrow"—by most of the people of the United States.

Our national mood and our Government's policy has changed. In the past few years, the United States has recognized the critical needs of Latin America, the tender balance in which it hangs—between freedom and communism—and the need for new policies and programs now exemplified by the Alliance for Progress.

The objectives of our foreign policy have remained constant in Latin America as they have around the world. Our desire is to assist our friends and allies in maintaining national independence and in building progressive democratic governments. This requires the creation of a viable economy and a capability for self-defense. When these have been achieved within a country, that country can then share its achievement, can then assist other countries in building stable free societies. This has been done in Europe in the decades following the war. It is now being done in Israel. It must be done in future decades in Latin America.

ISRAEL CONTRIBUTES TO AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

Many of the problems confronting Latin American countries today are those faced by Israel during the past 15 years. Before Israel could begin building a viable economy and a democratic government, she was forced to fight for her life—for her very existence as an independent state. Once her independence as a nation was secured, she turned to making the desert bloom, to building a model progressive democracy in the Middle East.

Israel has achieved this by a truly remarkable mobilization of her own resources, and by generous outside capital assistance. Israel has encouraged private investment, while using the power of government to improve the social and economic welfare of her people.

Having achieved this remarkable economic vitality and political stability within the framework of a democratic government, Israel is now sharing her abundance.

Israel during the past 5 years has extended technical assistance to almost 80 countries in Africa and Asia. It is now accelerating its aid to Latin American countries. Specifically, Israel plans to train about 200 Latin American students in the field of agriculture during the next year.

Israel has already shown what a small country with limited funds can do in the field of foreign aid. Her foreign aid program is very similar to our old point 4 programs—which concentrated on extending technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, rather than on large loans or grants for economic development. Israel is favored with a large pool of trained experts in the fields of agriculture, health, and education. The expertise that made the desert bloom in Israel will now be extended—by the Israelis themselves—to Latin America.

This new program for training agricultural specialists is not the first Israeli activity in Latin America. Already Israeli technicians are working on projects in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Venezuela.

In all of these activities, Israel is again demonstrating the value of human resources in developing less-developed countries. It is once again demonstrating that trained manpower is as essential to the economic and social development of a country as the large development loans which are now being given by larger countries and international lending institutions.

LATIN AMERICA MUST MOBILIZE ITS RESOURCES

If our Latin American neighbors are to achieve political stability and economic progress, they must mobilize their own resources as Israel has mobilized hers. They must install efficient, honest governments. They must overhaul their tax and agrarian systems. They must encourage private enterprise. They must devote more resources to education and health. Yet even if they do all of this, this will not be enough.

There will still remain a threat from the outside, a threat which will doom all other attempts to failure unless it is resisted. I refer to the threat of Castro-Communist aggression from Cuba.

We have heard far too much about the military threat of Castro to the United States and far too little about the Castro-Communist threat to the countries of Latin America.

This threat to Latin American nations, particularly those in the Caribbean, is not mythological. It is real. What are the facts?

The fact is that Red Cuba has become a base for the subversion of the hemisphere. It is now a base for the indoctrination and training of hundreds of Latin Americans, who have become experts in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla tactics. Cuba supplies covert material support, largely financial, to subversive groups. It is the base for an intensive propaganda campaign using printed materials, news services provided by Prensa Latina and powerful radio transmitters. In disseminating this propaganda, it cooperates with front organizations in Latin American countries in the form of friendship societies or committees for the defense of the Cuban revolution.

CASTRO-CUBA'S SUBVERSION

This systematic attempt to subvert democratic governments in Latin America is best seen in the case of Venezuela. Venezuela has become the No. 1 target of Communist attack in Latin America. The Communists have concentrated their attacks on Venezuela because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding in that country and giving it a chance for real progress under freedom. It has become the key target because President Rumulo Betancourt, who has just visited this country this week, has given the country 4 years of progressive democratic government.

From Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence, and terror in Venezuela. It is no surprise that of the 1,500 persons from Latin America trained in Cuba in 1962, the largest number have been Venezuelans. These young men have received a heavy dose of indoctrination in Castro-Communist ideology and guerrilla warfare. They have reported that they go through simulated offensive and defensive guerrilla exercises, are taught how to survive in the jungles, are given map and weapons instruction, as well as other training that every good guerrilla should have. The recent burning of the Sears Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracaibo oil refineries, and the pirating of a Venezuelan ship are all a part of this pattern of violence and subversion.

Venezuela has withstood attacks from Communist conspirators because its democratic government has been capable of defending itself against armed attack from

within. It has equipped itself, with generous support from the United States, to combat armed attacks, dynamiting, street riots, assassination, bombings, and plain murder. All of this violence is part of the strategy announced by Che Guevara, the Cuban Minister of Industries, in a recent interview with the Havana correspondent of the London Daily Worker: "The Cuban revolution has shown that in conditions of imperialist domination such as exist in Latin America, there is no solution but armed struggle." Both the Betancourt government and the U.S. Government have realized that to cope with such attacks, to cope with repeated attempt at armed insurrection, surplus soybeans are not of much help.

THE DEFEAT OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION

The control and defeat of Communist subversion requires men trained in riot control, counterguerrilla operations and tactics, intelligence and counterintelligence, public information, psychological warfare, and counterinsurgency units. The United States is assisting Venezuela and other Latin American governments by training selected Latin American personnel at U.S. military schools at Fort Bragg, N.C., and in the Canal Zone. Special U.S. counterinsurgency units are on 24-hour alert in Panama at this very moment. We are assisting through AID programs in public safety. We are helping through civic action programs designed to contribute to economic and social development and to establish a closer rapport between the military and the civilian population.

All of these programs are designed to provide a shield of security behind which the Alliance for Progress can develop. They are essential to preserve the stability and internal security which are necessary to carry the Alliance for Progress forward.

We have heard many suggestions recently for improving the Alliance. Some are justified. The administration of AID should be improved. The Washington bureaucracy should be shaken up. Latin American development plans should be more carefully developed and documented. Latin American reforms should be more rapidly implemented.

But even if all of these were accomplished, the threat to the Alliance for Progress would still remain so long as the Soviet-armed, Communist government governs Cuba and uses it as a base for subversion. The Alliance will remain endangered until the Communist government is removed.

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA

The United States must make it clear to all that our policy on Cuba is firm. Our policy is to remove Castro and communism from the Caribbean. This Red satellite will never be permitted to gain the status of an eastern European satellite—tolerated for the time being. Here the commitment itself is more important than the particular means and methods chosen to enforce the commitment. But the commitment must be enforced. The first step in enforcing it must be the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba. So long as the Soviet troops remain, Red Cuba can terrorize its Caribbean neighbors without fear.

The United States must make clear to the Soviet Union that the presence of her troops in the Western Hemisphere will no longer be tolerated. I am encouraged by recent indications that this lesson is beginning to sink home in the minds of Soviet policymakers. I am encouraged by the report that Premier Khrushchev will withdraw some of the Soviet troops in the next few weeks. But if our current diplomatic efforts fail, then the United States must forthrightly, if reluctantly, impose any measures necessary to insure the speedy achievement of this essential goal.

Once the Soviet troops have been removed, the United States and its partners of the OAS must decide on what further steps are needed to restore a government responsible to the Cuban people, a government genuinely dedicated to the welfare of its subjects. They must decide then which methods are most appropriate to pry loose the iron grip of communism on Cuba—whether economic pressure, a progressively stringent blockade of Cuba, or other measures.

In pursuing this aim of removing the Communist government from Cuba, we must allow our leaders wide latitude in choosing the means suitable to achieve this end. We must permit them considerable leeway in determining the timing and tactics in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Calm resolute leadership can often achieve the same results through patient negotiation as through belligerent threats.

In making this commitment we must make it unmistakably clear that the Castro-Communist tyranny will be replaced with a progressive government. A Cuban government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reform will have the firm support of the United States, just as the progressive Government of Venezuela does today.

Those countries in the Caribbean most directly threatened by Cuba might consider special measures to counteract Communist subversion. The Central American countries might consider the formation of a regional police force to preserve the security of the area. This should be considered next month when President Kennedy meets in San José, Costa Rica, with the presidents of the Central American Republics.

Our policy must make certain that the Alliance for Progress succeeds. The Cuban-Communist government must be removed not so much because it is an immediate threat to the security of the United States, but because it threatens directly the independence, the security and freedom of the Alliance. Merely removing Castro's Marxist-Leninist regime will not make the Alliance succeed. The U.S. Government has already made clear that it will generously support any government carrying out the social and economic development programs prescribed by the Alliance Charter. We are supporting Venezuela. We are supporting the Colombian 10-year-development plan through the international consortium. We are committed to helping President-elect Bosch transform the Dominican Republic into a model progressive democracy in the Caribbean.

With the removal of the Communist government in Cuba, the wholehearted support of progressive governments in Latin America, the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

HUMPHREY WARNS OF COMMUNIST ATTACKS ON VENEZUELA

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, said yesterday that the government of President Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela has become the number one target of Communist attack in Latin America.

HUMPHREY issued the statement in advance of the scheduled arrival in Washington tomorrow (Tuesday) of President Betancourt, who plans to meet with President Kennedy during his visit to the United States.

"The Communists have occupied Cuba," HUMPHREY said. "Now they seek to conquer Venezuela. The battle is on.

"Operating from Castro's Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence, and terror in Venezuela.

"The recent burning of the Sears Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracay oil refineries, and the pirating of a Venezuelan ship all are part of a pattern of violence and subversion."

HUMPHREY said that the Communists have aimed their attacks on Venezuela because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding in that nation and is giving it a chance for real progress under freedom.

"The attack is motivated also," the Senator added, "by designs on Venezuela's huge resources of oil and iron ore. Those resources could provide the economic base of Communist penetration of the entire South American Continent. They are part of a Communist goal of converting the Caribbean into a Communist sea."

HUMPHREY urged that the United States give the strongest support to the present Government of Venezuela headed by President Betancourt.

"Venezuela is now a progressive democracy," he said. "It is open and friendly to the United States and vigorously supports us in all international councils.

"President Betancourt's government respects private property and private investment. At the same time, it sponsors the broadest social welfare programs for its people."

The Senator added a call for a clear pronouncement by the United States that an attack of any type on Venezuela will not be tolerated.

"We should make it clear," he said, "that any attack will be repelled, regardless of the cost.

"The Betancourt government has made progress despite the torrent of terror from the extreme left and 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 the troubled Caribbean area."

SPACE SCIENCE AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune editorial of Thursday, January 31, tells the story of a most important development in the upper Midwest. The editorial said:

There are some occasions, in the life of a community or of a region, which have about them an air of history in the making. One senses that a milestone is being passed, that momentous beginnings are being made, that the occasion will be long remembered. Such an air of history being made could be sensed Tuesday night at a dinner meeing in Minneapolis when plans for an upper Midwest research organization were unfolded. This will be called the North Star Research & Development Institute.

The editorial goes on to comment on the address of Mr. James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In this remarkable address Mr. Webb demonstrated the intimate relationships between research and economic development and progress. Mr. Webb emphasized the importance that a great university can have to the economic development of an area. This is particularly true in this age of scientific and technological specialization.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the full text of the editorial be printed.

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

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Jan. 31, 1963]

A HISTORIC OCCASION

There are some occasions, in the life of a community or of a region, which have about

them an air of history in the making. One senses that a milestone is being passed, that momentous beginnings are being made, that the occasion will be long remembered.

Such an air of history being made could be sensed Tuesday night at a dinner meeting in Minneapolis when plans for an upper Midwest research organization were unfolded. This will be called the North Star Research & Development Institute. It will be sponsored by the Midwest Research & Development Council and the University of Minnesota, at the same time remaining an autonomous operation.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the potential impact of this institute on the upper Midwest's growth and development.

James Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, gave a clue to what might be expected when he told his Minneapolis audience that those regions and businesses which are quickest to comprehend scientific and technological change "will be in the forefront of progress and prosperity during the years ahead."

The research to be carried on through this institute is expected to attract new industries to the region and to encourage the retention—and development—of present industries.

To the institute, as it becomes increasingly recognized as a center of scientific talent, there should come a growing allocation of federally financed research and development work to the upper Midwest.

The area served by the institute should act as a magnet to research specialists. Trained men and women whom the region now exports should be encouraged to remain here.

It would be impossible to list here the many public-spirited citizens who have pushed to success the plans for this research institute. The raising of funds—the institute gets under way with assets in excess of $3 million—was in itself a remarkable achievement. But we feel that special mention should go to J. Cameron Thomson for the tireless and dedicated zeal with which he has worked to make the institute a reality.

Yes, Tuesday night's meeting was indeed a historic occasion. And the kind of history which this institute will make for the upper Midwest, in due time, should make very pleasant reading.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the establishment of the North Star Research & Development Institute, working in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and other Midwest colleges and universities, represents a dramatic and significant development in the long-range economic progress of the upper Midwest area. This area is blessed with an abundance of modern, competent, energetic business management; highly trained and skilled workers; an ever-increasing number of scientists and technicians; and many colleges and universities that are recognized for their high academic standards.

The meeting of January 29 at Minneapolis, Minn., was opened by Mr. J. Cameron Thomson, former chairman of the board of the Northwest Bank Corp. and presently president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council. The address of Mr. Thomson outlines the broad scope of activity of the Research & Development Council. Mr. Thomson presented to his audience the summaries of the economic studies that have been made by the upper Midwest.

Those in attendance at the dinner meeting of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council represented the financial, industrial, agricultural, labor, and scientific and educational resources of the upper Midwest area. The speeches of Mr. James Webb, Administrator of NASA, and Mr. J. Cameron Thomson, the president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, outlined a program of economic and scientific development that will have a far-reaching effect upon our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the addresses of Mr. J. Cameron Thomson and Mr. James Webb be printed at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that a list of the officers and directors of the North Star Research & Development Institute be printed in the RECORD, along with a press release of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, dated December 26, 1962.

There being no objection, the addresses, list, and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY J. CAMERON THOMSON, PRESIDENT, UPPER MIDWEST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, AT A DINNER MEETING OF THE COUNCIL IN MINNEAPOLIS, JANUARY 29, 1963

The upper Midwest, thanks to you, thanks to the generosity of the Minneapolis Area Development Corp., the Hill Family Foundation and the area's business leaders, and particularly to the University of Minnesota for its splendid cooperation, is definitely going to have a regional research and development institute. I predict that it is going to be a source of invaluable service to our economy and of pride to all of us.

The organization meeting of its board of directors, including the election of the initial slate of officers, was held this noon. Its name is the North Star Research & Development Institute. The institute is a major breakthrough for our economy; its establishment will effectively symbolize that our part of the country is on the move.

The present decade has witnessed highly significant developments, all part of an adjustment process leading to new growth, and now the institute adds a new dimension to our economy. The $250,000 pledge of the Hill Family Foundation and $500,000 from businessmen, together with the stock of the Minneapolis Area Development Corp., assures us of getting off to a sound financial start.

The institute results from the organization of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council by business leaders of the area in 1959. The following factors, affecting our economic growth rate, were the principal basis for the businessmen's concern and their determination to develop sound means to change the trend:

A decline in agricultural employment of 27 percent in the decade between 1950 and 1960.

A higher than average dependence on agriculture as a source of income and a lower than average percent of employment in manufacturing.

A per capita income in the region for 1960 roughly 13 percent lower than the U.S. average of $2,223.

A growth in nonagricultural employment during the decade of 13 percent as compared to the national increase of 18.2 percent.

The resulting outmigration of 392,000 persons during the 1950's—this net outmigration was concentrated among the younger age groups, and resulted in increasing the dependent nonlabor force members (persons under 15 and over 65 years of age).

Two basic factors in developing the program were these: First, that we must have the understanding and cooperation of leaders in government, education, agriculture, labor, and business in general; and, second, that we must find a basis for agreement on what needs to be done to promote economic growth. At this point an arrangement was made whereby the University of Minnesota and the Council went into partnership to provide an economic study of the major sectors of our economy.

This study is independent of the council's supervision and is being carried forward under a research committee headed by Frederick L. Deming, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, and Dr. James M. Henderson, research director, with the aid of qualified scholars. Up to date the upper Midwest economic study has issued the following study papers: "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Structure and Problems"; Migration and Population Growth in the Upper Midwest: 1950–60"; "Employment and Earnings in the Upper Midwest: 1950–60"; "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Alternatives for the Future."

Three technical papers also have been issued: "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Structure and Problems (Statistical Supplement)"; "The Geographic Impact of the Federal Budget"; and "Upper Midwest Commodity Flows, 1958."

Succeeding reports will deal with other major phases of the economy of the Ninth Federal Reserve District. This should facilitate open-minded consideration by the diverse elements in our economy because they can all approach the subjects from the same objective, competent analysis.

The study develops the facts as to the significance, history, and status of each major sector of the economy. It includes projections as to the probable status of each sector in 1975, based on present trends, and it will provide a summary of the alternative courses of action available in each sector to accelerate our economic growth rate. Dr. Henderson reports that the balance of the research material will be in the hands of the research committee by June 30, this year, where it will be reviewed, edited if necessary, and approved for publication.

Summaries of the economic study reports, as well as the reports themselves, are available to those requesting them and are distributed to a broad, representative list of citizens throughout the area.

The council's program is not simply a research project but is designed to aid in accelerating the economic growth of the Ninth Federal Reserve District. Based on the reports developed by the study, and further consideration by the council's action report committee and its coordinating committees dealing with agriculture, urban planning, and industrial development, the council will develop a tentative action program. This will be used as a basis for discussions with members of our advisory committees, other leaders throughout the area, and representative State groups. It is hoped that responsible consensus of opinion can be developed, which will reflect the broad public interest, rather than that of any particular group, industry, or political party.

The action report committee is headed by Joyce A. Swan, executive vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., with Julian B. Baird, retired chairman of the First National Bank of St. Paul, and Allen S. King, president of Northern States Power Co., serving as vice chairmen, and a generally representative committee from the area and different economic sectors. The specific coordinating committees are headed by the following people: Agriculture, Dean McNeal, executive vice president of the Pillsbury Co.; industry, Goodrich Lowry, president of Northwest Bancorporation, and Granger Costikyan, president of First Bank Stock Corp.; urban planning, C. David Loeks, director of Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission.

The industry committee will develop suggested programs which will take into account the distance from major markets, the resulting increased transportation costs, the relatively small purchasing power developed in the area, automation and its effect on employment opportunities generally, and specific effects on agriculture, mining, and transportation in our area. It will consider the continuing decline in agricultural employment and the resulting outmigration.

In the Department of Agriculture's booklet, "Food and Agriculture, a Program for the 1960's," the following statement relating to the decline in agriculture was made: "About 60 percent of the Nation's farms produce only about 13 percent of the agricultural output. New economic opportunities must be found for these people."

The booklet further states: "These larger commercial farms ($5,000 annual sales and above) make 87 percent of all farm product sales, but they represent only 39 percent of all farms. Most income from farming is earned by these larger farms." And again it says: "These two important goals—improving income and reducing costs—can be achieved together only if farm output can be reduced below needs for several years and then be allowed to increase over the long run at a rate equal to the rate of growth in demand."

According to one of the Department of Agriculture's own economists, John A. Schnittker, the administration's supply management approach is not designed to cope with all the complex problems of agriculture. Schnittker says the administration's program can help stablize markets but "it cannot provide good incomes to farmers on small, inadequate units. It cannot stop the trend to larger and larger farms. And it cannot provide managerial ability where that capacity is lacking."

The action report committee's basic objective will be to formulate policies which will enable the efficient farmer, meeting competition in the market, the opportunity for a reward equal to that in other sectors of the economy.

Consideration will have to be given to the effect of the Common Market's increase in tariffs that may limit the ability of farmers to sell their products in Europe on a competitive basis. Certainly the committee will give special consideration to the interest of efficient producers of hard spring and Durum wheat which are generally not in surplus. They should be permitted to continue to produce on a competitive basis without being subject to overall quota reductions on wheat which include those varieties in large surplus.

Consideration will be given to improving the position of our dairy farmers in their right to compete for a share in major metropolitan markets without artificial restrictions. Attention will be given to means for encouraging constant improvement in agricultural production and to the development of broader markets for our agricultural products.

I am sure the agriculture committee is interested and qualified and will welcome the cooperation of agricultural leaders in developing its tentative program for consideration.

As to urban planning—we are living in an urban age. In the Ninth Federal Reserve District 51 percent of the nonfarm population lives in 29 urban centers. Half of the total population of the State of Minnesota lives in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The problems of the relation of thousands, and even millions of people living closer together are continuous. They include congestion of traffic in population centers, unplanned suburban growth, the problem of unforeseen rapid growth in some localities as well as necesasry urban renewal projects in declining areas, and the overlapping units of government serving metropolitan areas. It is quite evident that the urban planning study is an essential part of the upper Midwest economic study. If these problems are not adequately dealt with, they affect the cost of doing business and, therefore, our ability to compete in the market.

We are fortunate in being able to avail ourselves of the excellent staffs of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Commission and the University of Minnesota which will facilitate the study and development of an action program.

Consideration must be given by the action report committee to the possibility of additional development of natural resource industries and to increasing the processing of materials produced in the area.

The effect of taxes, particularly those on property, will be studied. Recently I was advised of the tax situation affecting a major national industry which has its headquarters and manufacturing facilities in Minnesota, but also manufactures an identical product in a number of other States. Their total taxes, real, personal, franchise and income, reduced to a cost per hundred units, were 15 percent higher in Minnesota than in the next highest State and over four times as high as in the lowest competitive State. If we are to increase the employment possibilities in our area, with the resulting benefits to all citizens, we must make sure that efficient local manufacturers of products which are sold in the national markets are not handicapped by materially higher tax costs for similar goods and services than their competitors in other States.

Before considering the relationship of the research institute to the providing of additional job opportunities, I want to cite several favorable instances of progress in recent years.

The percentage of successful farms in the Upper Midwest has grown steadily in the past decade, and in 1959 more than one-fourth of all farms in the region had cash receipts in excess of $10,000. The percentage of farms in this "over $10,000" category is above the national average.

The per capita personal income of the farm population in the Upper Midwest remains somewhat above the U.S. average.

The upper Midwest has far fewer farms in the noncommercial (less than $2,500 cash receipts category) than any other region in the Nation.

Percentage growth rate, 1950–60

	Upper Midwest	United States
Oil and gas production	98.9	17.9
Electrical machinery	91.3	45.9
Machinery, except electrical	50.1	21.6

After another successful year of growth, the Minnesota electronics companies total 159, employing approximately 47,000 people with an estimated payroll of $260 million.

In terms of education and the quality of the labor force which the region has available, the upper Midwest fares better than the national average on several counts. The illiteracy rate is considerable lower than nationally, the percent of selective service registrants failing the mental ability test has been less than half the national average, and the per capita expenditure on education is higher than in the Nation as a whole. While the region loses some of its better trained people through outmigration, the residual adult population in upper Midwest urban areas is particularly well-trained when compared with urban areas in most other parts of the country. Among the urban adult population, the upper Midwest has a higher percentage of persons who have completed grade school than any other major region in the Nation. In terms of the percentage of those who have finished high school or college, the upper Midwest is exceeded only by the West.

Early research reports developed the major reliance of the area's economy on agriculture and the less-than-average employment in industry with agricultural employment continuing to decline. In seeking sound opportunities for new employment it is obviously necessary to think in terms of growth industries that are not particularly affected by freight rates and that are geared to the talents and skills of the area's people. The scientific-technological development affecting both defense and civilian employment and the growth possibilities in that type of industry suggested that we would add to the attractiveness of our area if it were fully equipped to compete in the production of scientific-technological products. It was noted that the areas showing the greatest growth in these fields had important research facilities and in some cases outstanding research institutes. Therefore, after consideration of the general question of accelerating our employment opportunities in the scientific and technological fields and consulting with leaders in industry, research and Government, we established the Research Institute Committee with Otto A. Silha, vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., as chairman. Without exception, those consulted concurred in the desirability of establishing a research institute. The committee recommended and the council approved the establishment of an institute, assuming we could have the cooperation of the University of Minnesota and the project could be soundly financed. The regents of the university joined in the plans which were developed to create an autonomous research institute which has just been incorporated. The requisite finances have now been assured, and the research institute is now in being. It is the first specific achievement of the council's action program.

The institute should enable the area to obtain its share of contract research from Government and Government agencies, from industry in the area, and from others seeking to utilize the skills that will be available through the research institute. It will aid the university in retaining desirable talent through affording its staff people opportunities for participation in research projects at the institute at their option. It will aid business generally by providing for research beyond the ability of an individual company to develop such research facilities, and by taking temporary overload projects for industries maintaining their own research staffs. It will add to the number and broaden the base of scientific-technological talents in the area. Through its direct and indirect benefits, it should be a major factor in stepping up our economic growth rate.

The research institute project could not have been completed without the enthusiastic support of those directly connected with the Upper Midwest Council; the services of the Research Institute Committee, the University of Minnesota and Government officials; the financial support developed by the council; and the major contribution by the Minneapolis Area Development Corp. The latter's gift and its potential, realizable value has materially strengthened and insured the research institute's ability to provide much of the capital that will be required for buildings and equipment.

The Upper Midwest Council's program, including the research institute, is in the interest of all Midwest citizens because it aims to increase their economic opportunities and their standards of living. It is by and for the people. It is challenging in its scope and its objectives. It is sound in attempting to accelerate our economic growth rate by objective study, analysis of opportunities and seeking cooperation in translating opportunities into more and better jobs. In so

doing, it may merit the comment made by Henry Heald, president of the Ford Foundation, that: "Those who have organized the upper Midwest economic study have acted in the best of the American tradition. They have combined energy and intellect to understand the sweeping forces which are industrializing and urbanizing our exploding population, and by understanding them, to direct, shape, and if possible, master them."

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, TO UPPER MIDWEST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., JANUARY 29, 1963

As many of you know, this is not the first occasion on which I have participated with the business, civic and educational leaders of this area in discussions of the scientific potential of the upper Midwest. I have met on several occasions, here and in Washington, with many of you and with your Senators and Representatives, to consider ways in which this region could participate more fully in our national space effort and utilize the scientific and technological advances to assist in solving your upper Midwest regional problems of development.

I am happy, therefore, to have this opportunity to participate in this meeting tonight because it represents, in essence, the fruition of a long period of effort on the part of many dedicated people. It is a significant occasion not only because of the contribution which the Upper Midwest Research Center can make to economic and other areas of progress in this region—something of concern to all of you—but because of what it can contribute to the success of our expanding national effort to achieve enduring preeminence in space.

My primary objective tonight is to discuss with you the effects of our space program—of our total national effort in scientific research and technological development—on the economic development of the Nation, and the means by which the business and industry of this or any other region can contribute to and participate in the benefits inherent in this effort.

First, however, I think it might be useful to examine what we are doing in space, why we are doing it, how we are doing it, and with what result.

Let me begin with a discussion of the major considerations which make it clear that an understanding of the space environment, and development of the technology which will enable us to operate in space, are an imperative of our times.

President Kennedy has said that "our leadership in science and industry, our hope for peace and security, our obligations to ourselves as well as to others, all require us to make this effort * * * and to become the world's leading spacefaring nation.

"We set sail on this new sea," the President said, "because there is new knowledge to be gained, and new rights to be won, and they must be won and used for the progress of all people. For space science, like nuclear science and all technology, has no conscience of its own.

"Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on men, and only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace, or a new terrifying theater of war."

You will note that the President did not say that our national goal is that of landing the first man on the moon, or, for that matter, of being first with respect to any single achievement in space. We have done many things first, and we will do many other things first—including, we feel confident, sending the first explorers to the moon—but this is not the objective which the President stated.

Rather, he forcefully declared our determination to attain "a position of preeminence" in space and to "become the world's leading spacefaring nation."

It is essential that this distinction be clearly understood. The mastery of space, and its utilization for the benefit of mankind, will not be determined by any single achievement. Superiority in the space environment will be won and held by that nation which first accumulates all of the scientific knowledge, all of the technology, all of the experience, all of the space testing, launching, and terminal facilities for massive space machines, and all of the aids to space navigation required for safety and regular service.

These are the capabilities and resources which the United States is now engaged in bringing together and using in our national space effort.

President Kennedy's eloquent description of the urgency of our space activity might be more specifically defined by citing four major motivations for the effort now underway:

First, the rocket engine, which can operate in the vacuum of space by carrying its own supply of oxygen, has given us and other nations the means to explore and utilize the space medium. Given this ability, and the spectacular achievements already made, our citizens and those of other nations assuredly will not remain confined to this small planet. We and they will explore space, and knowing this, we, as Americans, can settle for nothing less than a position at the forefront of that pioneering effort.

Second, the first Soviet sputnik, and further demonstrations of Soviet advances have made it evident that the United States cannot retain its position as leader of the free world—that, in fact, there may be no free world to lead—if we forfeit to any other nation the opportunity for preeminence in this important new field of science and technology.

Third, it is apparent that our national defense—perhaps even our national survival—demand that we act to insure that no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us.

The fourth and most important of the major reasons for undertaking a broad national program of space research and development—the one which promises the greatest rewards for mankind—is the certainty that the basic scientific knowledge gained, and the technological applications which will flow from it, will offer vast returns on our space investment here on earth over many years ahead.

How do we use the capability which the rocket engine has given us—the capability that has enabled us to discard such ancient maxims as "what goes up must come down," or "the sky is the limit"?

For our program in the space sciences we use more than a hundred sounding rockets a year to speed outward from the earth, take measurements near the earth and out to a distance of one earth radius, and fall backward to the earth's surface.

For measurements over longer periods of time and outward to greater distances, we use larger rockets to send out satellites carrying a wide variety of scientific instruments which orbit the earth, some in circular orbits at a few hundred miles, some in elliptical orbits that reach outward several hundred thousand miles. These scientific satellites pass time and again through the various regions of space surrounding the earth, taking continuous measurements and monitoring such phenomena as the radiation in the Van Allen belts, which is caught by the earth's magnetic fields and held in the regions surrounding the earth.

You are probably familiar with some of these scientific satellites such as our own orbiting solar observatory, and the two international satellites, Ariel and Alouette, which were launched as cooperative ventures with Great Britain and Canada.

To explore space beyond the reach of satellites, we use deep space probes like Mariner II which we sent within 21,600 miles of the planet Venus, which measured important features of the planet and transmitted great quantities of data back to earth across 36 million miles of space.

Probes such as Mariner II permit the taking of measurements far out from the earth and the correlation of these with measurements taken near the earth and on the surface of the earth. The ability to measure energy streaming from the sun out millions of miles, then again just above the earth's atmosphere, and again as it reaches the surface of the earth, is expanding our knowledge in many areas related to the earth's atmosphere and weather.

In addition to the data obtained, the flight of Mariner II gave us important experience. The successful use of the highly complicated midcourse correction maneuver, and the very long range tracking and transmission of data—which lasted until January 4 when Mariner was about 54 million miles from the earth—will help to insure the success of future missions.

Even larger spacecraft are required for manned exploration of space. Learning from the Mercury spacecraft which first circled the earth under automatic control and then again carrying Enos the chimpanzee, and then under the control of man as John Glenn circled the earth, we now have designed and are building the two-man Gemini spacecraft. This will give us experience with the weightless condition and other factors in space for a week or more. And beyond this, the three-man Apollo spacecraft which we have under contract will have a capability to orbit the earth a month or two and later will serve as the basic mother craft for manned landing and exploration of the moon.

Parallel with the use of sounding rockets, scientific satellites, deep space probes, and manned spacecraft goes the development of those specialized spacecraft which already are performing useful functions. The Tiros weather satellite has been launched successfully six times and has vastly expanded our understanding of the weather and of the amount of energy absorbed by the earth and reradiated by the earth—knowledge essential to improvements in our capability for understanding the weather and using it most effectively.

The experimental communications satellites, Telstar and Relay, have proved the usefulness of satellite relay stations in space and have begun to lay a foundation on which the ability of man to communicate by telephone, other types of messages, and by television, can be vastly expanded. The world's international communications network bids fair to undergo a revolutionary period of progress as a result of our new knowledge about how to use satellites.

All of the activities which I have described, and additional ones we will undertake in the future, form the basis for a continuing driving U.S. effort to achieve preeminence in space.

The efforts in space of the United States and the Soviet Union have attracted widespread attention throughout the world, not only because of the expansion of knowledge of the universe but because achievements in space have come to be taken as a measure of a nation's scientific leadership, technological capacity, and industrial strength. As we in the United States proceed to carry out our own space program, we are without doubt being judged on our ability to make decisions, concentrate effort, and manage vast and complex technological programs.

The road to preeminence in space may be a long one. It certainly will not end on the moon, regardless of which nation lands the first explorers there.

To achieve and maintain preeminence we must conduct scientific investigations on a broad front. We must demonstrate a continuously advancing technology which enables us to utilize increasingly large vehicles in orbit around the earth and to send both robot and human explorers to the moon and the planets. We must substantially improve our propulsion systems. We must devise reliable means for supplying large amounts of internal electrical power for spacecraft. We must develop instruments and life-support systems that will operate unattended and without maintenance for long periods. And we must improve our equipment and techniques for transmitting and receiving great quantities of data over vast distances.

The success of our space program is dependent upon rapid advances in increasingly efficient use of energy; the development of new materials, metals, fabrics, and lubricants which can withstand wide ranges of temperature, vibration, radiation, and vacuum; the most advanced electronics; and the marriage of all of these with the life sciences.

Important for you, who are leaders in the upper Midwest, is the fact that all of these are the very same forces which underlie and determine economic growth.

But also worthy of your attention is a new situation, so new it is little understood, related to the developments of the past decade. Today this new situation involves the radically new concept that the inventions and innovations which make the best use of the newest advances in these new physical science areas can come only from intellects which have acquired a sophisticated, complete understanding of the basic laws of nature as they have unfolded at such a rapid rate. This means a research-oriented, university-trained, and frequently a university-based mind.

And just ahead of us is yet another new area. This comes from the situation that the new frontiers of knowledge in the physical sciences have laid a foundation for the same type of rapid advance in the life sciences. I am told that just ahead is a breakthrough in understanding of the life processes, just as we now understand the atomic processes.

What this means to you, to me, to all of us, is that the full development of the possibilities inherent in the application of scientific and technical advances can usher in, has the potential for, a period of economic growth that will bring a flowering of human progress, education, and culture. But because the application of this new knowledge must be more sophisticated than it has been before, the university, one of the few powerful continuing institutions in our society, which by its nature must do research and must prepare the graduate and postgraduate trained minds for this new period, must also somehow find a closer relationship with the business community.

It is more important than ever to preserve and foster the concept that in our society it is the entrepreneurial mind of the practical businessman that provides the means for the application and realization of these benefits. Innovation in this new field of industrial-university relationships can, I have no doubt, be pioneered on the science-technology-engineering frontier of the upper Midwest if you who are leaders of this community really desire to apply foresight to the most pressing problems of your region and participate in the development of widely shared goals.

In the past, many of our Nation's largest programs in research and development have either been of a defense or atomic nature, and therefore classified for national security reasons.

Now much of our space program, under the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, is unclassified. Under this law, NASA is required to consult with the scientific community, which largely means the university community, in the design of its program and experiments, and to report not only to this scientific community, but also to the general public on the agency's activities and the results thereof. Further, the fullest measure of cooperation with other nations and with scientists from all the world is specified in this basic act of Congress that established the space policy of the Nation.

Under these circumstances, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not building up large classified Government laboratories, but is contracting as much as possible of its advanced research and development to qualified industrial firms, private research organizations, and to colleges and universities. Our policy is to place research contracts and grants at those universities where the scholars themselves, the consensus of the faculty, and the administration of the university are interested in having the work progress on a broad interdisciplinary basis, drawing together creative minds, knowledge, and resources from many fields such as mathematics, physics, astronomy, chemistry, biology, sociology, management, economics, and medicine for widely shared participation. Under this policy, NASA research proceeds within the university in the closest association with graduate and postgraduate education, thereby replenishing and augmenting the supply of highly qualified scientists, social scientists, engineers, and technical experts.

It is an important fact to education, to industry, and indeed, to all persons and groups interested in economic, social, and political growth, that the technical fields in which most of our advanced work is done embody the very forces with which regional and community leadership are concerned. These are the forces with which regional leadership must work for progress, improvement, and greater efficiency.

It is also true that the institutions through which citizens and regional community organizations and leaders cooperate to utilize these forces are not as yet strong and reliable. It is our hope that the policies underlying NASA's contracts and grants with universities, its contracts with industry, and the new means we are creating to bring these groups into closer working relationships will make for a widespread strengthening of these institutions of local and regional cooperation, as well as understanding and capability for applications yielding benefits beyond the scope of the specific instruments and devices in our space program.

These policies can, we believe, increasingly create situations within which the interdisciplinary groups working with us in the universities, if joined with other forces for progress and growth in the community, lay the base for even more rapid assimilation and use.

Today, it is accepted that growing industries tend to concentrate in regions where research facilities are best. No part of the country can afford to neglect investments in advanced scientific and engineering education and in first-class research facilities.

Modern industry, too, has much to gain from regional cooperation in support of the universities and associated research efforts. Industrial leaders are beginning, more and more, to look to the universities of their region for the most important resource of the age—ideas, scientific brainpower, and advanced technological skill, experience, and judgment.

It is not a question today of whether a region can already qualify—can now offer the human and natural resources required—for a particular industrial plant or Government facility.

The question is whether the region is creatively doing what it can to equip its citizens to serve their area and their Nation in a period when our prosperity and our very existence as a free people depend on scientific and technological leadership.

This discussion implies that a corporation, or even a regional area, will remain competitive, and prosper in this new age, only through the closest coordination between educational institutions and business and industry, with the institutional scientists finding a more clear-cut role in feeding into the industrial stream the new knowledge which flows from a vast research and development effort.

But, in my view this would be quite incomplete and skewed dangerously in one direction unless this process also encompasses an effective means for a feedback into the more powerful and intellectually oriented institutions from the entrepreneurial mind of the practical businessman, the man who under our system must take the risk for profit or loss, and his associate, the experienced engineer who must see that things—even new things—work and give service.

As this becomes more fully realized, those regions and businesses which are quickest to comprehend the significance of this tide of change, and move with this tide will be in the forefront of progress and prosperity during the years ahead.

How, then, does all this relate to the establishment of a research center to serve the upper Midwest region?

I have indicated that we in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration consider it essential that, to the extent possible, our contracts for basic research be placed with universities. Thus, while achieving our research objectives, we also contribute to the development of a continuing supply of highly trained scholars who know how to use brainpower, the most critical resource in this new age of science and technology.

Meanwhile, however, we regard most seriously our responsibility to try to assure that the results of this research are available for use by the industrial community, for the benefit of every American.

Since 1955, the Federal investment in scientific research and development has grown fivefold—from slightly over $3 billion to almost $15 billion included in President Kennedy's budget for fiscal year 1964. Industry is expending an additional $5 billion a year for the same purpose.

As a result of this tremendous research effort, there are published each day, worldwide, scientific papers in quantity sufficient to fill seven complete sets of the Encyclopedia Brittanica—60 million pages throughout the world each year.

Because of this vast research and development effort, scientists and engineers are compressing into one 10-year period—this decade of the 1960's—an intensified research and development program that would normally take 50 years.

In the space program, the principal incentive is the fact that we must learn to understand and operate in a new and hostile environment, under conditions which man has not encountered before: very high vacuums, cosmic rays, ionized gases, tremendous accelerations, great extremes of temperature, violent stress of vibration and shock.

Coping with these conditions has resulted in lighter materials, increasing use of chemicals for applications heretofore considered impossible, new electronics systems, new coatings, new materials capable of withstanding the temperature of liquid hydrogen, 423° below zero, as well as rocket thrust chamber temperatures ranging almost to 5,000° above.

The businessman, it has been said, needs to know more about these new materials than his father knew about steel. The executive whose understanding of materials is limited to the difference between a metal and

a plastic may find his competitor passing him by. And the same may be said for the new processes and manufacturing techniques developed in space research.

But how can the businessman know what he needs to know about this great mass of research in an era in which, for example, a young chemist who decided to spend his life reading the literature of chemistry would fall 10 years further behind during each year of effort?

The answer may lie, as I have suggested, in the development of close relationships between university-based scientists and the industrial community, with evolving but differing ratios of attention to basic research, and to the development of applied research to convert basic knowledge to practical applications.

It is for this reason that the memorandum of understanding announced today running parallel with a grant of about $700,000 to the University of Minnesota for the construction of research facilities, provides that the university "will undertake, in an energetic and organized manner, to create a broadly based multidisciplinary team to explore mechanisms whereby the progress and research results achieved in space science and technology may be fed into the industries and segments of the economy with which the university normally has close relations."

This memorandum of understanding also specifies that "research is to be encouraged on ways and means to expand and search for practical applications and in the economic and social impact of our national involvement in space exploration. Furthermore, the university will undertake to make the scientific community, as well as the industrial and business communities, aware of new opportunities for application of specific developments or processes stemming from the space program."

Supplementing these efforts of the university, your Upper Midwest Regional Research Center can make a great contribution to the area which it serves. And, if you will permit me to make a suggestion, to the business and industrial representatives here, one way to start in your pioneering of new approaches, would be to consider a reciprocal arrangement to the one I have just described—one in which you reach out to the universities of the region in the manner that the University of Minnesota has just agreed to reach out to you.

An outstanding example of what can be accomplished is the Midwest Research Center in Kansas City, Mo. Over the past 18 years this nonprofit institution has worked with about 900 industrial firms and 200 State and Federal agencies, performing some 2,500 different research assignments.

Recently, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this research institute has explored the problem of effecting industrial application of space research in several Midwestern States. Although only a pilot project, conducted on a limited scale, many potential applications of space research results have already been uncovered. Perhaps the most spectacular example was that of a firm which was about to build a $4 million facility to manufacture a new product. Midwest Research Institute acquainted them with an explosive metal forming process which the firm now plans to use. It is estimated that it will reduce the firm's construction costs by $1½ to $2 million.

There is no doubt that the Midwest Research Institute has been of great value to the area which it serves, and I have no doubt that the research center planned here can be of equal value to you, particularly because of the close association which it will enjoy with the universities of the region.

I strongly believe, as my presence here indicates, that it is a project which deserves support, not in competition with, but as an addition to university activity in the region. May I suggest, however, that those who support it, should do so only while recognizing their continuing obligation to support the basic research programs of the region's universities, which are, after all, the heart of progress in the fast-moving age in which we live.

May I close by congratulating all of you for the progress which you have made in the development of this research center during the period since I first became aware of your interest in it, and by expressing my confidence, and that of my associates in NASA, that it will fulfill not only your, but our, hopes for it.

NORTH STAR RESEARCH CHOOSES OFFICERS

Officers of the North Star Research and Development Institute were elected at a luncheon meeting Tuesday.

Chairman is O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota.

Other officers include J. Cameron Thomson, president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, vice chairman; Philip H. Nason, president of First National Bank of St. Paul, treasurer; Wendell T. Burns, executive secretary of the Upper Midwest Council, secretary.

Vice presidents will be Philip B. Harris, senior vice president of Northewestern National Bank of Minneapolis; Lloyd A. Hatch, vice president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; A. A. Heckman, executive director, Hill Family Foundation, and Otto A. Silha, vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

The officers are also directors of the institute. Other directors include:

Prof. Neal R. Amundson, department of chemical engineering, University of Minnesota; Dwayne O. Andreas, executive vice president, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul; Julian B. Baird, retired chairman, First National Bank of St. Paul; Charles H. Bell, chairman, General Mills, Inc.; Judson Bemis, president, Bemis Bros. Bag Co.; Prof. Sherwood O. Berg, department of agricultural economics, University of Minnesota.

Christian F. Beukema, president, Oliver Iron Mining Division, United States Steel Corp., Duluth; James H. Binger, president Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.; H. William Blake, president, Northwestern National Bank of St. Paul; Prof. John R. Borchert, Department of Geography, University of Minnesota; Herbert P. Buetow, president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; Francis E. Butler, St. Paul; Prof. John A. Buttricfi, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota.

Dr. Edgar M. Carlson, president, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.; Frank G. Chesley, president, Central Research Laboratories, Inc., Red Wing, Minn.; Prof. Preston E. Cloud, Jr., Department of Geology, University of Minnesota; J. E. Corette, president, Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.; H. H. Corey, chairman, Geo. A. Hormel & Co., Austin, Minn.; Granger Costikyan, president, First Bank Stock Corp., John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

Dean Bryce Crawford Jr., Graduate School, University of Minnesota; Richard E. Crawford, president, Minnesota Valley Natural Gas Co.; Thomas M. Crosby, president, Northwest Growth Fund, Inc.; Harold J. Cummings, president, Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co., St. Paul; Albert H. Daggett, president, Gould-National Batteries, Inc., St. Paul; John Daniels, president, Archer Daniels Midland Co.

Provost Raymond W. Darland, University of Minnesota, Duluth; Prof. Emeritus Edward W. Davis, Silver Bay, Minn.; Donald C. Dayton, president, Dayton Co.; Frederick L. Deming, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis; Robert Faegre, president, Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.; L. E. Felton, president, Green Giant Co., Le Sueur, Minn.; Daniel C. Gainey, Josten Manufacturing Co., Owatonna, Minn.; Frederick R. Gamble, vice president, Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.

Paul S. Gerot, president, Pillsbury Co.; Dean Paul V. Grambsch, School of Business Administration, University of Minnesota; F. Peavey Heffelfinger, chairman, F. H. Peavey & Co.

Robert E. Hess, Minnesota AFL–CIO, St. Paul; Prof. Leonid Hurwicz, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota; A. B. Jackson, president, St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; St. Paul; E. F. Johnson, president, E. F. Johnson Co., Waseca, Minn.; A. J. Jordan, Jr., president, Jordan Millwork Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; David G. Kelly, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Allen S. King, president, Northern States Power Co.

David M. Lilly, president, Toro Manufacturing Corp.; Chester C. Lind, president, First National Bank of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Goodrich Lowry, president, Northwest Bancorporation; Prof. Walter O. Lundberg, Hormel Institute, Austin, Minn.; Laurence R. Lunden, vice president, University of Minnesota; Robert S. Macfarlane, president, Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul; Dean Harold Macy, Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota; Dr. C. W. Mayo, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.

Adrian O. McLellan, president, Merchants National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak.; Donald G. McNeely, president, McGill-Warner Co., St. Paul; Arthur C. Melamed, president, Coast-to-Coast Stores Central Organization, Inc.; D. C. Minard, president, Trane Co., La Crosse, Wis.; John A. Moorhead, president, Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis; Gerald T. Mullin, president, Minneapolis Gas Co.; Gordon Murray, president, First National Bank of Minneapolis; Leonard H. Murray, president, Soo Line Railroad Co.; John M. Musser, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., St. Paul.

Prof. Will M. Myers, Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota; Prof. Alfred O. C. Nier, Physics Department, University of Minnesota; William C. Norris, president, Control Data Corp; Donald Nyrop, president, Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Jay Phillips, president, Ed Phillips & Sons Co.

John S. Pillsbury, Jr., president, Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.; Ed W. Rawlings, president, General Mills; B. H. Ridder, Jr., publisher, St. Paul Dispatch & Pioneer Press; Paul Schilling, chairman, Waldorf Paper Products Co., St. Paul; the Right Reverend Monsignor James P. Shannon, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul; Prof. W. G. Shepherd, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Minnesota.

Dean Athelstan Spilhaus, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota; Francis C. Sullivan, attorney, Duluth; Dean W. T. S. Thorp, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Minnesota; Prof. Maurice B. Visscher, Department of Physiology, University of Minnesota Medical School; Dr. Cecil J. Watson, Mayo Memorial, University of Minnesota.

Stanley J. Wenberg, vice president, University of Minnesota; Paul B. Wishart, chairman, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.; R. G. Woodworth, senior vice president, Cargill, Inc.; Cyrus G. Wright, chairman, Otter Tail Power Co., Fergus Falls, Minn., and Willis D. Wyard, First American National Bank, Duluth, Minn.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—Minnesota, excluding the Twin Cities, gained 56,325 nonagricultural jobs during the decade from 1950 to 1960.

Employment growth in out-State towns and cities was a substantial 13.3 percent but 4.9 percent less than the national average,

according to the Upper Midwest economic study report on "Employment and Earnings Growth" prepared by R. Stephen Rodd and Dr. James M. Henderson with the assistance of John S. Adams.

The study is being jointly sponsored by the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council and the University of Minnesota. Results of the research are to be used in the council's action program aimed at accelerating the economic growth of the region.

The report treats the Twin Cities metropolitan area and the remainder of the State as to two separate economic areas, "with different structures and patterns of change."

Employment growth in Hennepin, Ramsey, Anoka, Dakota, and Washington Counties, included in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, was 101,475 or 20 percent, 1.8 percent above the national average for the decade.

Nonmetropolitan Minnesota is dominated by the farming economy but to a lesser degree than other States in the Upper Midwest, the report states. Manufacturing provides almost 17 percent of all nonagricultural employment; iron mining accounts for 3.3 percent. Railroads, retailing, and local government have comparatively high shares in total employment.

Although employment rose less rapidly than nationally, manufacturing grew by 15.5 percent, one-third faster than the U.S. average. Growth was especially strong in dairy products, paper, chemicals, fabricated metals, machinery, and instruments. Most service activities showed less rapid gains than in the Nation, the exception being Federal Government employment.

Almost all of the decade's growth took place in the first 5 years of the decade, when an 11.9 percent growth slightly exceeded the national rate. The latter 5 years were a period of decline in construction, retailing, and railroads, offset by expansions in manufacturing and local government.

For the region as a whole the gain in nonagricultural jobs during the decade was reported as 211,000. Job losses and gains were distributed among the areas as follows: Minnesota (as a whole) 157,800; Montana 20,700, North Dakota 20,174, South Dakota 23,698, northwestern Wisconsin —5,142, and Upper Michigan —6,809.

National average earnings per employee in 1960 were $4,764 and in Minnesota were only $106 less than this amount. For the other areas the earnings per employee were: South Dakota $3,798, Montana $4,330, North Dakota $4,026, northwestern Wisconsin $4,148, and Upper Michigan $4,346. The report explained that these below average levels of earnings were partially the result of "weighting toward relatively low earnings sectors—trades, services, and State and local governments."

Manufacturing employment for the region grew by 8.3 percent, contrasted with the national growth of 9.8 percent. Percentages for each area: Twin Cities 13.8, other Minnesota 15.5, South Dakota, 12.7, Montana 8.7, South Dakota 4.6, northwestern Wisconsin —3.2, Upper Michigan —32.1.

The report concluded, "Mining, trade, services, government and railroads are of greater than average relative importance in the Upper Midwest—manufacturing less important." The region's historical ties are becoming less apparent with passage of time. With the exception of northwestern Wisconsin, the employment distribution more closely resembled the national distribution in 1960 than in 1950.

ADEQUATE HOUSING IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 30, 1963, at the International Housing Workshop here in Washington, two major addresses were delivered which illuminate the critical problem of the development of adequate housing in Latin America. One address was by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, and the other was by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

I commend both of these addresses to those who are interested in accelerating the construction of housing in Latin America.

Housing is unquestionably one of the priority needs throughout all of Latin America, and unquestionably the growth of the savings and loan movement, and the interest of American builders in constructing in Latin America are promising developments. Both should be strongly encouraged by our Government, in addition to the self-help cooperative and public housing programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an address by the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN and an address by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray to the International Housing Workshop on January 30, 1963, in Washington, D.C., entitled "The Savings and Loan Movement in South America."

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

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL HOUSING WORKSHOP, JANUARY 30, 1963, NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am pleased to have been invited to make the keynote address at this morning's workshop session on international housing.

There is gathered here today a small but select group of housing and foreign aid experts and representatives from the home building industry all interested in oversea housing. An all-day meeting of such a group, representing the points of view of both the hardheaded businessmen and the more theoretical internationalist, should come up with some practical recommendations for improving our housing assistance programs abroad.

Some of you builders who have had experience in building abroad have come here to discuss existing aid programs and to make recommendations for improving them. Some of you who are new to this subject are anxious to learn about the programs and what the prospects are for the future. These are worthwhile objectives but I understand that the organizers of this meeting want to broaden the discussion as wide as possible to answer the question—how can housing become a more effective instrument of U.S. foreign policy?

It is indeed gratifying to see on all sides so much interest being generated in the subject of international housing. Only last week in Lima, Peru, a large number of U.S. housing and savings and loan experts met in conference with representatives from practically all the Latin American countries to promote the expansion of thrift and home ownership in those countries. Also last week in New York, the United Nations held a meeting of the new Housing Committee of the Economic and Social Council. Concurrent with that meeting, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials conferred on international housing.

I only hope that meetings like these will crystallize the interest in international housing into specific recommendations for action. I say this because our accomplishments to date are not particularly noteworthy and we need the benefit of the thinking and support from groups like these to get the program off the ground.

In talking to you about foreign aid housing, I am sure there is no need to dwell on the housing problem in the foreign countries. The United Nations published a report recently stating that two billion people, or two-thirds of the human race, live in countries where dire poverty and deprivation prevail. Of this number, about one-quarter billion live in countries which are underdeveloped and friendly to the free world and desirous of our help for advancing their economic well-being.

In past centuries, the people of these countries have been content to live in their squalid condition. Today, through improved communication and transportation, these people have learned that the world has better things to offer than the inevitable hunger, disease, and slums of the past. They are no longer content. They want something better and they intend to get it one way or another.

The United States has committed itself to help these people. President Truman's point 4 program was the first recognition of our responsibility to the people of the underdeveloped countries of the world. Much has transpired since then and many hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by our Government in its effort to stabilize the world through economic and social assistance programs.

Assistance for housing, however, was never considered very important and nothing of any great consequence was accomplished up until 1960 when the Development Loan Fund was first used to finance the purchase of homes.

The first big breakthrough in the legislative front occurred in 1961 when the Congress appropriated $394 million for the social progress trust fund to be administered by the Inter-American Development Bank to make loans for housing and other activities for the social development of the Latin American countries.

Also the 1961 act initiated a program of investment guarantees for housing. This, the so-called all-risk guarantee, was to insure U.S. investors against loss up to 75 percent of the investment in pilot or demonstration private housing projects of the FHA type in Latin America. This provision was welcomed by the homebuilders at first as a most attractive device for getting the mortgage money to finance homes to be built in Latin America. But the program did not click. The 75-percent guarantee was not acceptable to our institutional lenders which meant that the sponsors would have to deposit assets to cover the other 25 percent in order to get a loan.

In recognition of the difficulty, the 1962 Foreign Assistance Act was written to authorize the U.S. Government to guarantee the investor against all losses provided there was an appropriate participation by the investor in the risk. This very liberal guarantee applied not only to housing loans for Latin America, but for all the less-developed countries participating in our foreign-aid program. A new ceiling of $180 million of guarantees was established under the 1962 act for the all-risk provision under section 221(b), and $60 million was earmarked specifically for Latin America housing under section 224.

As of now, we have had one project approved. This is for a housing project of 2,000 homes for middle-income families in Cali, Colombia. The financing arrangements as you would expect, are somewhat complex, involving a $7 million long-term loan by a U.S. firm to a Colombian institution. Our Government, under section 224 of the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act, will cover 75 percent of the loan, or $5¼ million. The

Colombian Government is joining our Government in guaranteeing the U.S. investor against loss, either due to normal economic factors or currency devaluation. The downpayments by the purchasers will comprise 20 percent of the purchase price and monthly payments over a 10-year amortization period. The houses sell for about $5,500.

I understand that one other project is ready for approval under this provision, and several others are in the final stages of approval. No more applications are being accepted at this time because the Agency says that applications on file are for amounts well over the statutory limit. There is some criticism of this because none of the section 221 money has been committed for housing. The statutory limit referred to by the Agency is the $60 million under section 224.

There are many questions about this program which I am sure you will raise today. This is not an easy program to administer. Builders have objected to the slowness of the application approvals and some of the so-called redtape involved not without justification. However, there have been many difficult problems faced by the small staff assigned to this. Considering its international aspects, I should think that FHA underwriting would be relatively simple compared to this type of underwriting, and I hope in your discussions today that you will keep this fact in mind and that your comments will be of a constructive nature to help the Agency improve its processing.

As you know, I sponsored the 1962 amendments on investment guarantees for housing because I saw the great need and opportunity to get U.S. builders and American capital together to get the international housing program underway. At the same time, I realized the risks involved and cautioned the Agency on its administration of the program. I proposed that an advisory committee of well-qualified mortgage and homebuilding experts be established to help the Agency formulate policy. I was told by Mr. Hamilton, the AID Administrator at that time, that it was a good idea but, as of today, nothing has happened. The last time I checked, I was told that the President was about to name the committee. I do not wish to scold the Agency but its performance under this program has not been very satisfactory.

The other active program of the Agency for International Development is the promotion of savings and loan associations in the less-developed countries. Thrift and homeownership are concepts which have been deeply instilled in our American tradition and we are proud of the part that the savings and loan associations have played in making our country the best housed in the world. This accomplishment is shared by our great homebuilding industry. But these groups could never have done the job unless there was a ready market financially capable of purchasing the house.

It is this combination of economic forces that needs to be brought together in the less developed countries to insure an adequate production of housing.

As of today, the U.S. Government is helping, through technical and financial assistance, to start savings and loan systems in Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and one African country, Ethiopia.

The most successful has been the Chilean program. Let me tell you about it because it can well represent a model on which other countries can build.

In 1958, a team of U.S. technicians made recommendations for the establishment of a savings and loan system with a central bank to operate on a quadruple capacity as supervisor, an insurer of mortgage loans, a guarantor of deposits, and a secondary mortgage facility. In addition, because of the inflation problem, a maintenance of value system was recommended to solve the problem of currency devaluation.

The first charter for a savings and loan association was issued in 1961. Today there are 20 associations chartered and accumulating savings at a rate of $1 million a month.

Savings per person are small—only about $300—but this is not bad considering that the average wage paid to workers is about $1 a day. As of August, about 2,000 mortgages had been approved by the board of directors of the associations.

One of the features of the Chilean system is the maintenance of value provision. This is an extremely intriguing device to counteract the effect of inflation. By its terms all savings accounts and all outstanding mortgage loan balances are adjusted annually in accordance with the changes in the index of salaries and wages.

There were many critics of these provisions who doubted that an adjustment formula would ever work. It was said that savers would not mind because they received an upward adjustment in their account, but the borrowers would complain bitterly if their unpaid balance were to be increased significantly by the adjustment.

This is a problem and I would not want to discount its possible impact on certain nonwage earning people, but all I can say is that the Chile experience has survived its first year. On June 30, 1962, the system applied its first adjustment—12 percent to both savings and lendings. For savers, the 12-percent increase was added on top of a dividend paid, amounting to 3 to 4½ percent.

There have been many problems in creating the Chilean system and in watching over it as it grew. There is one feature which I think may have initially accounted for the Ch'lean success whereas other countries have failed. Our Government has followed through in Chile by retaining an outstanding technician to work along with the new organizations and to help them in every way. This necessity for follow through, I strongly feel, cannot be stressed enough. Like golf or bowling, the game may be lost if accuracy is marred by failing to follow through.

All of this leads me to the current bill before our committee to establish an International Home Loan Bank. The bill, introduced by Senator SMATHERS and cosponsored by me, has two purposes—first, to accumulate capital and, secondly, to provide trained technicians for the establishment of mutual thrift systems in underdeveloped countries. I consider these two purposes of equal importance. One cannot function without the other. U.S. dollars alone, flowing into these countries, would be worthless unless accompanied by technicians trained in how to use these dollars to create a self-supporting thrift system within the recipient country. Likewise, technical assistance would be worthless without U.S. dollars backing it up and acting as a "big stick."

The bill would limit the investment of a U.S. savings and loan association to 1 percent of its assets, so certainly no one can say that this is a profiteering activity even if the rate of return might be somewhat higher than for domestic loans. In Chile and Venezuela, the maximum interest charged the buyer is 7 percent on these loans.

The bill would provide for ex officio representation on the Board of one person from Treasury Department and one from State Department in order to avoid the criticism leveled at an earlier bill that the Board may act independently of our foreign policy in making dollar loans to foreign governments. This charge was the most serious one raised against the bill and will be probably the most difficult hurdle to overcome in getting administration support. Whether the ex officio representation will answer the objection will not be known until we have a chance to hear from the State Department.

We also heard questions about how the International Bank would be assured of its repayment in U.S. dollars by foreign governments. I assume that some guarantee will need to be given by the recipient government, but I am not sure what would happen in case of a change in the government or if the government had such a dollar shortage that it could not possibly repay the Bank in dollars.

Although we do not hear much about it in the open discussion, I believe that another objection to the bill involves the feeling of some that a big savings and loan program would be a lopsided one in accord with the need. Its beneficiaries would be mainly middle-income rather than the low-income families, where the greatest need exists.

There are many answers to this objection, but I think most important of all, the program is not proposed as a Government subsidy program. It is a private enterprise activity seeking Government acquiescence to carry out the intent of our foreign aid program to help these countries in their economic and social development.

Regarding the economic level reached by such housing, I recall an interesting observation made by several Latin Americans that communism is fired up more by frustrated intellectuals than by the uneducated poor. These people, many of whom have white-collar jobs, feel their lack of housing just as badly as the poor peon. They know that much of the housing shortage is unnecessary and can cause a lot of trouble. A middle-income program of home financing, therefore, is critically needed for this group.

There is not much question but that a good comprehensive program should be concerned about housing for all levels of family income. Cooperative housing has had some success in providing housing for the middle-income families. Self-help housing and Government-owned housing seem to be the most common method suggested to take care of the great masses of ill-housed low-income people. But our Government can do relatively little here, other than to provide some technical assistance, because of the very magnitude of the problem.

This leads me to tell you about a study currently being undertaken by our subcommittee on the subject of international housing.

The purpose of this study is to review our programs of housing assistance in the less developed countries and to consider proposals for improvements. We invited 36 scholars and housing experts to submit papers on a number of topics relevant to this subject. Those papers are on their way to the printer and should be available sometime this month.

In addition to the papers, we have requested reports from the Agency for International Development, the Organization of American States, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Among the topics in the study, one of the most important is the relationship between housing and economic development. As you know, many economists have claimed that housing as a consumer good should be a low priority item in our foreign assistance program. They have said that U.S. dollar assistance should be given or loaned to less developed countries only for productive enterprises which would result in earning foreign exchange for the recipient country. Otherwise such assistance would be inflationary.

We have received several excellent papers on this subject which provide support for

an entirely new point of view. After reading these papers, I feel that there will be a great deal more understanding, not only of the economics involved, but also of the socio-political factors in housing assistance, both of which are of important consideration in our foreign assistance program.

I am sure that this subject is bound to come up today in your discussions, and I shall look forward to the conclusions you might reach on it.

We also have requested papers on topics involving organizational problems, that is, what agency (AID, the U.N., IADE, OAS, etc.) should do what. The jurisdictional issue is always a matter for discussion at meetings of this kind.

Other papers raise questions about where private enterprise fits into the program. We also asked what the city planners could do and how the building materials industry could be stimulated in the foreign aid countries.

Also how does our Government insure that proper community facilities are installed as a prerequisite to construction of homes financed with U.S. funds.

Aided self-help, cooperative housing, slum clearance, and public housing are covered.

We also have papers on what can be done to train the people of these countries to do the job themselves. We wanted to know what new educational devices should be developed. Is our OAS school in Bogotá doing an efficient job and should such a school be expanded further? Should similar training schools be established in other parts of the world?

We tried to cover all facets of the subject and we are very pleased with the responses. The papers represent a lot of hard work on the part of the writers and the committee is very grateful to them.

Many of these same topics will be discussed here today because they are fundamental to the issue and our Government is still searching for answers in order to establish policy. I understand there are some Government people here today so you can be assured that your discussions will not go unnoticed. Furthermore, the subcommittee would be very happy to receive from you any resolutions that might result from this meeting.

The Savings and Loan Movement in South America

(By Joseph P. McMurray [1])

It is truly a privilege of a high order to say a few words today on the savings and loan movement in Latin America.

The very fact that it is now possible to refer to such a movement in that part of our hemisphere which lies to the south of us speaks volumes. Until quite recently, accuracy would have permitted no more than references to surveys, proposals, or beginnings.

It is not so today. The existence of such a movement is attested by the number of countries in which the legal foundations have been laid for systems of these institutions, by the progress which has attended their establishment in a number of those countries, and by the enthusiastic support which was given to the first Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference, held last week in Lima, Peru, and attended by my colleague on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Mr. Joseph J. Williams, Jr., who has given me most favorable reports of its success.

Most of you are not directly connected with savings and loan associations, and I think I should give at least a very brief background statement about them.

The typical savings and loan association is a privately owned, operated, locally organized and managed thrift and home financing institution. It holds itself open to receive savings from members of the public, to whom it pays earnings on those savings periodically, and it invests those funds in long-term loans on homes and other residential properties, including construction loans. The ability with which it performs these functions is illustrated by the fact that the approximately six thousand savings and loan associations in this country presently hold such savings in the amount of some $80 billion, their total assets exceeding $93 billion.

While privately owned, and privately operated by their own boards of directors and managers, they are, like banks, examined and supervised by State officials or bodies, or, in the case of those which are federally chartered, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, of which I am Chairman. That Board also supervises the Federal home loan banks, which are credit facilities for all Federal associations and for such State-chartered associations as become members. It likewise directs the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures, up to the statutory limit, the savings of members of the public in all Federal associations and in State-chartered associations which avail themselves of this insurance.

No one who attends this workshop will, I am sure, leave without a keen awareness of the appalling lack of adequate housing in Latin America. Two primary causes of this situation have been, first, the absence of modern techniques in housing construction, and, second, and not least, the dearth of long-term home-mortgage financing for the building and purchase of homes. At the root of this shortage of available financing has been the lack of such a group of financial intermediaries as the savings and loan associations which we have here.

Experience both in the United States, with its savings and loan associations, and in Britain and the British Commonwealth, with their similar institutions known as building societies, has given impressive demonstration for many years of the way in which institutions of the savings and loan type can serve the small saver, the home builder, and the ultimate home buyer and owner.

The belief that such institutions can fill a similar role in Latin American countries has been a natural outgrowth of that demonstrated success. It has been fostered by the experience in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, where ethnic backgrounds and other factors have been similar to those in Latin America and where, in approximately a decade savings and loan associations have been established and now have approximately $115 million in assets, they have fully proved their viability both in the savings and in the home financing field.

With this background of experience in this country and elsewhere, a number of the leading personalities in the savings and loan industry of this country, beginning at least as far back as 1958, made surveys of greater or lesser depth in some 12 Latin American countries to sound out the feasibility of the establishment of savings and loan associations in those countries. They did this quite generally under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration and its successor, the Agency for International Development, although in some cases on their own initiative. Outstanding contributions of time and effort were also made to this work by executives and staff of leading savings and loan trade organizations.

Passing from the survey stage, comprehensive legislation has been drafted for many of these countries, and in some five of them there are now associations in operation.

In Chile, within approximately 2 years, according to information received through channels which are unofficial but which I believe to be reliable, there have been established 21 associations with over $16 million in savings and some 22,000 investors, and with approximately 3,000 mortgages approved or in process. In Peru, according to information similarly received, eight associations are underway, and these associations have generated approximately $2 million in savings and have granted more than 800 loans.

The types of facilities provided have generally paralleled those in this country, with the addition of a facility similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

They have, therefore, generally included four distinct elements. The first is a facility to charter and supervise savings and loan associations. In our country these functions are performed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or, in the case of State-chartered institutions, by the State authorities. The second is a facility with functions similar to those of the Federal home loan banks, to provide funds for the associations for seasonal and emergency needs, as well as additional funds for home lending. The third is a facility similar to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to insure the savings placed in the associations. The fourth is a facility to insure residential mortgages in a manner similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

With the passing of the survey stage, the primary need in the area of what I may call human assistance, as distinguished from financial assistance, is first, for aid in developing sound patterns of law and regulations; and, second, but second only in point of time, for assistance in the training of executive and operating personnel.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, along with other governmental agencies and the savings and loan associations and their trade organizations, has been happy to be of help in this field.

Thus, the Board provided a member of its legal staff to assist in the development of legislation and regulations in El Salvador. It made available its Director of Federal Home Loan Bank Operations as a member of a two-man team of consultants for the Agency for International Development in connection with the establishment of a savings and loan system in the Dominican Republic.

Later, it provided a staff member of its division of supervision to serve, with a vice president of one of the Federal home loan banks, in a consultant capacity in the drafting of regulations to implement the newly enacted savings and loan laws in that country. The other Board members and I have made ourselves freely available for consultation by savings and loan officials of interested countries, and have encouraged our staff to do so.

I would not have you conclude that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has been the sole or even the major source of such assistance. The desire to aid our Latin American friends in this respect has been a real grassroots project in the savings and loan industry. The associations themselves and their trade associations, together with the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank, have responded ably and enthusiastically to the need and have sent trained savings and loan personnel on mission after mission to the south, and several associations have opened their offices to on-the-job training of Latin American personnel in the United States.

Perhaps the most dramatic measure has been the recent joint action of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and one of the national savings and loan industry organizations in sponsoring a group of some 30 Peace Corps volunteers

[1] Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., before the International Housing Workshop, National Housing Center, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, Jan. 30, 1963, 12:30 p.m.

who, after a period of training in this country, will assist in the establishment and operation of savings and loan associations in Peru. I am proud to say that one of the members of our examining staff has taken leave from his work with us to become a member of that group and thus contribute the benefit of his specialized skill as an examiner of savings and loan associations.

There is, however, great need in this field not only for human assistance but also for financial assistance, in the form of "seed capital" to aid in the establishment of these new associations. The Inter-American Development Bank and the Agency for International Development have supplied some $40 million in loans for this purpose, but there is need for much more.

For some time now there has been a view on the part of responsible persons, both within and without the savings and loan industry, that the savings and loan associations of this country could themselves provide at least a part of the funds needed for this purpose.

Among other recommendations, it has been felt that such a course would provide an additional element of good will as a people-to-people approach and would afford a just measure of recognition to the savings and loan associations of this country in their furnishing of the technical aid and specialized knowledge which is such a vital part of the operation.

A number of bills were introduced in the last Congress with the general object of providing such assistance through an International Home Loan Bank which would be under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board but would be operated through its own board of directors.

This bank would have authority to sell its shares to savings and loan associations and to savings banks in this country and to provide assistance for the development of similar institutions in underdeveloped countries, either by making direct investments in such institutions or by making its funds available to the central savings and loan facilities in those countries, which in turn would make them available to the individual associations.

While the administration reached the conclusion that it would not favor the enactment of such legislation at that time, it was made clear that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was expected to continue its study of the situation and to continue its cooperation in the rendering of advice and technical assistance in this area, which it has done.

In the present Congress legislation of this nature has been introduced both in the Senate and in the House. In the Senate, sponsorship has been from both sides of the aisle, in the form of a bill by Senator SMATHERS, cosponsored by Senator SPARKMAN, and a bill by Senator DIRKSEN. In the House the sponsorship has been of an equally distinguished nature, including bills by Representative PATMAN and by Representative MULTER, of my own State of New York.

I would suggest that these bills deserve the careful study and consideration of all who feel, as I do, that the interests of this country would be aided by the development of a strong element of savers and homeowners in the underdeveloped countries, and particularly in Latin America, and by the emergence of an efficient and effective home construction industry in those countries.

A beginning has been made If we want this movement to flourish it will need the interest and enthusiastic support of people like yourselves and the organizations which you represent. But all our efforts and all your efforts, in my opinion, will not do the job unless there is set up some sort of an international organization for this specific purpose. I suggest to you that the International Home Loan Bank, or some similarly organized institution, may do the job. The administration and the Congress will be studying it and I respectfully suggest that it also deserves your careful study, deliberation and action.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I was necessarily absent from the Senate on official business. I understand that at that time the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], introduced a bill to create a Commission on Science and Technology. It is S. 618.

It is a privilege for me to join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations in sponsoring the proposal to create a Commission on Science and Technology. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, it has been a great source of satisfaction to me to work along with the chairman in conducting studies and holding hearings on various proposals which were directed toward bringing about more efficiency and economy in the operations of the numerous scientific research and development programs being carried on or supported by the Federal Government, which is the objective of the bill.

As the chairman has pointed out, the cost of these Federal activities has risen from less than $5 billion in 1956 to a budget estimate of approximately $15 billion for fiscal year 1964. Beginning early in 1958, the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on Reorganization began hearings on various Federal activities in the field of science, directed primarily to the deficiencies in the Federal science information processing programs. At these hearings, held in the 85th and succeeding Congresses, the committee developed much information on the need for reorganization and better coordination of Federal science activities. The bill being introduced by the chairman is therefore the culmination of nearly 5 years of study by the committee and its staff, during which period a number of reports and documents have been submitted to the Senate for the information of Members of Congress.

These studies developed a pressing need for constructive action by the Congress in effecting essential reorganizations in the administration of the Federal research and development programs, in order to eliminate unnecessary duplication of activities, thus effecting economies of operation and insuring better utilization of funds made available for these programs and, even more important, the conservation of our limited number of highly qualified scientific and technical personnel.

The committee, in attempting to draft and submit legislation to the Senate directed toward eliminating existing deficiencies and effecting necessary reorganizations of Federal science programs, was unable to develop agreements among the scientists, technologists, educators, and other officials concerned with these activities, and after hearings directed toward these objectives in the 86th and 87th Congresses, concluded that there was an urgent need for a coordinated study of the problems involved by those who were best qualified to recommend remedial legislative action. Therefore, the committee recommended the creation of a Hoover-type commission to conduct such a study and to submit appropriate recommendations for action by the President and the Congress. The Senate approved, by unanimous action, a bill—S. 2771—late in the 87th Congress, which failed of final approval in the House of Representatives last year.

The subject bill is identical to the committee's proposal which passed the Senate on August 8, 1962. I assure the chairman that I shall give him my wholehearted cooperation and support of the measure he is introducing on behalf of the committee, so that it can receive early consideration by the Senate and the House in the present Congress.

Mr. President, I believe Members of the Congress will be interested in extracts from a Summary of Activities of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, during the 87th Congress, as it relates to scientific research and development and, specifically, to scientific information and communication.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these extracts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IMPROVED INTERAGENCY COOPERATION ON BUDGET PLANS

In the subcommittee's review of Federal budgeting for research and development, it found that there was inadequate exchange of long-range plans and programs, involving literally billions of dollars of Federal expenditures.

A principal focus of the hearings was on the need for fuller exchange of budget forecasts and plans between, on the one hand, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, on the other hand, the many other Federal agencies which contribute to research and development in the Nation's civilian space program. These other agencies include the Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, National Science Foundation, and others.

In the wake of the subcommittee's interest, Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric and James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for the first time, in July 1962, exchanged letters providing for review by each agency of the other's long-range program for space research.

This type of mutual review had been a principal goal of the subcommittee's hearings.

B. COOPERATION ON SCIENCE INFORMATION

As a result of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of interagency coordination of information, numerous further improvements in information systems are being made throughout the executive branch. The principal such changes are occurring in the Agency with the largest single research and development program, the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense has issued an important new directive for a "vigorous, well-organized, thoroughly coor-

dinated, comprehensive technical information program."

In addition, in the Defense Department, as in all principal Departments and Agencies, a single individual is, for the first time, being made responsible for direction of programs of scientific information. This action, long suggested by the subcommittee, is a major step forward toward increased efficiency.

In the near future, a report from a panel on information of the President's Science Advisory Committee is expected to be issued. The establishment of this high level, expert group and of an information committee .n the Federal Council for Science and Technology, represent direct results of this subcommittee's efforts.

Recognizing that the taxpayer's interests could best be served by apprising the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, the Reorganization Subcommittee has made available special analyses. Thus, within a 3-month period the chairman of the subcommittee submitted four separate mimeographed reports to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. Each of these reports documented serious weaknesses in information programs of major agencies, which were at the time asking for funds for the 1963 fiscal year.

Subsequently, both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees utilized judgment expressed within these Reorganization Subcommittee reports in the course of reports on fiscal year 1963 fund bills.

Throughout its endeavors, this essential fact has been stressed by the subcommittee, the American taxpayer continues, unfortunately, to suffer serious losses because of shortcomings in Federal information programs. The yield from billions of dollars of taxpayer-supported research and development effort is lowered; scientific manpower is often squandered in needless, unintentional duplication of effort. A regrettable fact is that literally tens of thousands of federally sponsored scientific and other reports have been "lost" or "buried." A single report may cost the American taxpayer $1,000 or $1 million or more. Conversely, its location and timely use may save incalculable sums and man-years.

C. COOPERATION ON DRUG RESEARCH AND REGULATION

Among the many results of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of interagency coordination of drug research and regulation, are the following:

(1) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, has asked interested Federal agencies, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, to review the coordination of their respective drug programs.

(2) Efforts toward increased coordination are under way within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as for example, between the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health.

(3) The World Health Organization has been encouraged to improve international cooperation in exchange of drug information.

D. COOPERATION ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ABROAD

As a result of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of oversea technical assistance, increased coordination is under way between: (1) the Agency for International Development, and (2) those domestic departments of the U.S. Government which are technically competent to render technical assistance to the emerging nations. These domestic departments include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, etc.

Specifically, a series of new agreements between the Agency for International Development and the domestic departments has been and is being negotiated. Under these agreements, the domestic agencies will take over an increasing share of the workload abroad.

FORMER SENATOR BENTON'S ARTICLE POINTS UP SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGE OFFERED BY U.S.S.R.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is clear that the 88th Congress will make some of the most important scientific decisions in American history.

As we are all aware, the President's budget proposes a little under $15 billion for support of scientific research and development, testing, and evaluation.

This is more than one out of every $6 in the Federal budget.

This is big money, but it is for big purposes—national security, national growth, national health. None of these goals is obtained at the "bargain basement."

In connection with our future scientific policies, I commend now to the Congress an important article by one of our former colleagues, the Honorable William Benton, president of Encyclopedia Britannica.

He brings to bear upon this as on other issues an encyclopedic knowledge, drawn from the experiences of a remarkably varied career.

Businessman, educator, former high official of the State Department, political scientist, Bill Benton knows how to extract from specialists the best of their insight and to communicate it to the Nation.

In a notable article which he wrote for the Saturday Evening Post, former Senator Benton cited his observations at one of the most significant locations on the face of the earth, namely: Novosibirsk, in western Siberia. The article was entitled, "Inside the Siberian Science City."

The fact is that Bill Benton, who has covered much of the world, including the Soviet Union on four occasions, was the very first American to see in operation this remarkable center of Soviet research. Up until that time, Novosibirsk had been "off limits."

In that city, as elsewhere, he astutely recognized the larger implications of what he was permitted to see. He recognized, for example, the meaning of the Soviets' "big push" in applied science. He noted, too, the significant facts of Soviet scientific education.

Thus, "In the basic Soviet primary-secondary school, every student is required to take 10 years of mathematics, 5 of physics, 4 of chemistry, and 2 of biology."

Meanwhile, Soviet scientific efforts are concentrated, he noted, not in universities, but in research institutes directly related to the industries which they are intended to serve.

Bill Benton has, of course, neither suggested nor implied that we slavishly imitate the U.S.S.R. But he, like other keen students of East-West competition, stresses in effect that we keep our eyes and ears and minds open. He emphasizes that we understand what the U.S.S.R. is doing, why, and how well or poorly Soviet means are working. We will then be in a better position to come to our own decisions for our own purposes in our own way.

We as a Nation do not ever propose to be "second best" in science or technology. Former Senator Benton's article helps to make sure that we keep informed on this scientific race.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his vital article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INSIDE THE SIBERIAN SCIENCE CITY

(By William Benton)

Deep in the forests of Siberia, near a vast manmade lake, the Soviets are building one of the most extraordinary scientific centers in the world. Its implications can be ominous for us. The only way to suggest an American counterpart would be to imagine the U.S. Government merging the theoretical-research departments of Harvard and the University of Chicago with the applied research divisions of General Electric & Bell Telephone Laboratories—and establishing them all in a new headquarters on the outskirts of Detroit. This is roughly what the Soviets are planning for their science city outside the industrial center of Novosibirsk in Siberia.

The new establishment, just now nearing completion, is a striking symbol of the Soviet intellectual challenge to the West. It is a complex of 15 separate scientific institutes designed to house 50,000 research workers. It is dedicated not merely to theoretical research of the highest order but to solving practical problems in fields ranging from hydraulic mining to the translation of ancient languages. And this new science city is only the first of several that the Soviets plan to build across Siberia.

Since Novosibirsk is closed to most foreign visitors, only a handful of Americans have seen even the site of this science city. Among them are former Vice President Richard Nixon, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, and Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. What they saw was largely a blueprint. It was only recently, when I visited Russia, as a guest of the newly created Institute of Soviet-American Relations, that an American first saw the science city actually in operation. Perhaps I should add that I had told the Russians that I had no training in science and that I wouldn't recognize a secret if my nose were rubbed in it.

CEREMONIAL AT DAWN

It was 5:20 a.m. when I landed in Novosibirsk, 1,750 miles east of Moscow, together with Mrs. Benton and our 20-year-old son, John. A representative of the mayor, plus the chief learned secretary of the Siberian department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and a third official welcomer were on hand to meet us and drive us to our hotel. Our suite there, according to our escort, was indisputably the most luxurious hotel suite in the entire Soviet Union. It had ceilings at least 20 feet high, beautiful oriental rugs, a piano in the living room, and stiff, uncomfortable furniture.

Like the rest of Siberia, Novosibirsk scarcely corresponds to the Western image of a cold slave-labor prison. For one thing, it was hot when I was there, as hot as any town in Iowa. A village of a few thousand at the turn of the century, Novosibirsk was originally used as a camp for construction workers building the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Its big growth came during World

War II, when the Soviets brought in great industrial plants evacuated before the Nazi push into western Russia. Today it is an industrial city of 1 million, roughly comparable to Detroit or Cleveland, a producer of turbines and steel and mining machinery. Its paved central square is about the size of four or five New York City blocks, without greenery of any kind, and its opera house is the biggest in the U.S.S.R. Across the tops of the buildings on the main square are four great electric signs saying "Peace to the world, glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, long live Leninism, long live the Soviet people." Most of the city's buildings are a drab gray. In winter the temperature falls to 50 below zero. All things considered, it is not surprising that the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences originally opposed the plan to build a costly academic center there.

"You won't be able to persuade top scientists to move to Novosibirsk," he said.

"We can get the brilliant young ones," Khrushchev reportedly answered, "and we can train them there. The young scientists do the creative work."

HOW THE CITY BEGAN

When Khrushchev decided to go ahead with the science city 4 years ago, it was only part of a regional plan for the development of the whole area. One of the first steps was to dam the mighty Ob River, creating the Sea of Ob, 125 miles long, and providing enough power, heat, and light for both Novosibirsk and the science city. Then teams of construction workers arrived, and 12,500 of them are still at work on the project.

When we reached the science city—a 12-mile drive along a broad and modern but nearly empty highway from Novosibirsk—our car pulled up in front of the Institute of Geology. Waiting to greet us was Mikhail Lavrentiev, chairman of the Siberian department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and head of the science city. He is a tall, stooping man with friendly eyes, and an eager host.

The 15 new institutes occupy great squat 3- and 4-story buildings somewhat resembling Soviet "efficiency apartment" houses. The unadorned facade of each institute faces a wide Avenue of the Institutes. Two main buildings have been in use for 3 or 4 years. Others were incomplete, still encased in scaffolding. None of these massive oblong structures had yet acquired the red stars or statutes of Lenin that typify many public buildings in the U.S.S.R. Virgin forests behind the institutes provide room for expansion while shielding them from bitter Siberian winter winds. "We tried to preserve as much of the forest as possible," said Lavrentiev.

The names of the institutes give an idea of the scope of these drab new scientific palaces. Squarely in the center of the compound is the Institute of Geology and Geophysics. Next door is the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques. Then comes the Institute of Genetics, then the Institute of Experimental Biology and Medicine, then Hydrodynamics, Kinetics and Combustion, Applied Mechanics, and so on. I asked about nuclear reactors but was told this particular science city had no need of one.

The layout makes each institute an autonomous unit. Yet the institutes depend horizontally on each other for support—as shown by their locations. The Institute of Inorganic Chemistry, for example, stands next to the Institute of Thermophysics so that the scientists in one can work closely with those in the other.

Not far away from the institute buildings, on newly cleared forest land, workmen have already completed the first big physics and chemistry building of the new University of Novosibirsk, begun at the same time as the science city. The university already has 1,000 students, and the enrollment will increase to 4,000. The students will work at the institutes in research projects.

What goes on in this remote research center? As one example, which seemed rather strange in the middle of Siberia, the Soviets report that their computers have deciphered a Mayan Indian script which philologists had worked on for decades. Sergei Sobolev, head of the Institute of Mathematics, proudly presented me with a three-volume account of the work. Another group, the Geology Institute, has 92 survey teams investigating Siberia's wealth of iron, sulfur, copper and oil. "There is so much unknown and so much to be discovered," said the group's director, Andrei Trofimuk, a solidly built man of about 40. "Siberia has every mineral that exists."

"BETTER THAN MOSCOW"

The most spectacular demonstration that I saw was the use of a mining machine called a water-pressure cannon, developed by the Hydrodynamics Institute. It looks like a bundle of pipes, perhaps 10 feet in circumference and 8 feet long. From a safe distance we watched while the cannon fired at a 3-foot-thick chunk of granite. There was a loud bang. The granite splintered into a dozen fragments. In the same laboratory we saw a piece of copper about 8 inches thick with a hole shot through its center by one of these water cannons. Lavrentiev boasted of the machine as "15 times better than Moscow has been able to do." We in the United States have nothing comparable to this for our mining industries.

The opportunity to work and get ahead in such laboratories—along with the comparative luxury of a house and garden of one's own—has indeed brought young scientists to Novosibirsk, as Khrushchev predicted. By now there are 12,500 of them (as well as 11 members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences). Arnold Romanov, for example, at the age of 29, is the head of a key section in the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques. A fascinating young man who has read widely in English literature and speaks our language well, Romanov sparkles with enthusiasm about his work. Here, he says, a gifted man "gets a bigger job quicker." "The scientists are not alone," Lavrentiev added. "They have wives and children and grandchildren, and we take care of them."

The scientists don't spend all their time in laboratories. After our first morning at the center we lunched at the clubhouse for the institutes' top research scholars. There was a lavish array of 30 or more dishes—red and black caviar, tomatoes, cheeses, meats, bottles of wine and vodka. The next day we joined Lavrentiev and four colleagues in a 50-foot motor launch and chugged across the Sea of Ob to a camp run by the Academy of Sciences.

The camp, in a forest of tall, aromatic pines, consisted of three or four substantial log houses, together with half a dozen tents and small cabins. We saw a number of women and children—though we got little chance to talk to them. A rotund, tanned, bearded individual greeted us with a load of fish he had caught that morning. By the time we had all taken a swim, the bearded man had prepared a steaming fish soup with a chunk of pike floating in it. With that came caviar, salad, cheese, wine and vodka, all served as a picnic beneath the tall white birches near the water. It made me think of some fantasy—portrayed by Manet, described by Tolstoy, and catered by Brillat-Savarin.

I wanted to find out more about how the Soviet scientists viewed their own role in the world. I asked Lavrentiev whether he didn't feel that many sciences were getting so specialized that a scientist found himself learning more and more about less and less. Lavrentiev thought not—at least in his own case. As a boy of 11, he said, he had fallen in love with a mathematical puzzler called the four-color problem. The problem is this—how many different colors would you need to use on any map so that no two adjoining states are the same color, no matter how many states there are or what their shape? Lavrentiev said mathematicians had proved that five colors would be enough for any possible map, and that three would not be enough, but nobody had been able to prove mathematically that four would suffice. He named a Swedish scientist who had devoted a lifetime to this problem, but, as for himself, he had gone on to other things.

We agreed that there should be more exchange of information between our countries, but I mentioned the problem of the Soviets' unwillingness to abide by international rules of copyright and royalties. Sobolev, head of the mathematics institute, asked whether Russian writers got any royalties in the United States. When I said they did, he remarked that a publisher asked his permission to publish two of his mathematical works but there had been no royalties. He couldn't remember who the publisher was, and I never found out what had happened to the books in the United States. I said that books of this sort sold on such a small scale that there were few royalties.

As for more popular writers, I recalled that I first heard of the American ex-Communist novelist, Howard Fast, when I learned some years ago of his great popularity in the Soviet Union. I added that he had become better known in the United States since he abandoned communism in 1957. "It's exactly the reverse here," laughed Sobolev. And in fact I no longer found Fast's books on sale in the U.S.S.R.

I asked the members of the group to speculate on the future. What did they foresee?

"How can we foresee the future?" Sobolev asked. "All we know is that there will be more changes in the next 50 years than have been created in all the past history of the world put together."

I asked whether he agreed with the assertion by some experts that 90 percent of all the scientists who have ever lived are alive today. He thought a moment and then nodded in agreement. But not everyone accepted the implication that many scientists means great scientists. "There is no Newton alive today," said Academician Ilya Vekhua, rector of the University of Novosibirsk.

In their conversation, as in their work, the scientists of Novosibirsk revealed an important difference in the way scientific training is organized east and west of the Iron Curtain. In the basic Soviet primary-secondary school, called the 11-year school, every student is required to take 10 years of mathematics, 5 of physics, 4 of chemistry, and 2 of biology—in addition to such humanistic studies as history, literature, and a foreign language. On the basis of this broad background the student is encouraged to specialize as soon as he has finished the 11-year school. Since the tuition at all levels is free, a gifted student, no matter how poor, can develop his talents for the benefit of both himself and the state. Nor are these talents trained independently of the nation's industrial growth. There is no sharp division, as in the West, between the applied science of industry and the more prestigious theoretical science of the university.

"The graduates of the university must be as close as possible to industry," Lavrentiev told me. "You look to your universities to train your scientific personnel and to do your basic theoretical research. In the U.S.S.R. the really great scientific achievements do not develop within the walls of the universities but within the walls of the research institutes like this one."

The reality of the Soviet scientific achievements can scarcely be disputed. It is obvious not only in their space triumphs but in less spectacular fields such as surgery, oil drilling and oceanography. Judging from what I saw at Novosibirsk, there will be further achievements at the new Siberian science cities (the next such center will be at Irkutsk near the Mongolian frontier). Today the Kremlin is systematically developing all its science and education according to its current view of what Soviet society needs.

If the Russians have sacrificed butter for guns, they have sacrificed meat for education and research. Are we Americans making similar sacrifices?

The U.S. Government is indeed pouring massive amounts of money into the scientific programs at our universities and elsewhere. It is encouraging more applied research as part and parcel of the theoretical investigations to which our great scientists have been traditionally devoted. Our corporations, too, are intensifying projects to bridge the gap between theoretical and applied research. Some are building research laboratories near the campuses of our universities.

If the Soviets forge ahead of us in science it will not be because their highly coordinated system is necessarily better than our system. Prof. Robert Marshak, a University of Rochester physicist who has been appraising recent advances in Soviet science, believes the United States will continue to lead in pure and theoretical science for some time to come because our system is more ideally suited to such research. But he warns that we should expect the Russians—because of their greater stress on applied research, their expanding budgets and their ability to focus almost unlimited resources on selected problems—to make "numerous short-range breakthroughs in applied science." A case in point is the Soviet lead in booster rockets for space capsules.

Shortly before leaving Novosibirsk I commented to Lavrentiev that the Soviet educational system was designed not for the individual but for the state. He did not disagree. As for myself, I told him I once had been the only young man in the United States to get 100 percent in the comprehensive college-entrance examinations in mathematics. Following my own inclinations, I have led a widely varied life as an advertising executive, a U.S. Senator, a top State Department official, a trustee of several universities and head of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. In the Soviet Union the Communist system would inevitably have directed me toward a career in science.

With the calm confidence of the new Soviet scientific elite, Lavrentiev said, "Perhaps you would have been better off in mathematics."

Like most other Americans, I certainly want to go on deciding such questions for myself.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Sunday was the 45th anniversary of the birth of a new nation. On February 24, 1918, the Estonian National Council proclaimed the independence of the small Baltic Republic of Estonia. More than a formal proclamation, however, was needed to transform the Estonian declaration of independence into reality. For nearly 2 years—in the midst of one of the bitterest and most savage conflicts in the history of modern Europe—the Estonians fought for and won their de facto independence. We should pause to pay homage to those patriots who gave their last measure of devotion in this struggle.

Sometimes it is difficult for an American to conceive of the turmoil, the anarchy, the indescribable sufferings which accompanied these battles on the eastern marches of Europe. Contrary to the widespread impression, the last shots of World War I were not fired on November 11, 1918. The Estonian War of Independence lasted long after the armistice on the Western Front. It coincided with the incredibly brutal conflicts of the Russian Civil War and the Soviet-Polish War. At one point it appeared that bolshevism was destined to spread to the heart of Western Europe. Thanks to the bravery of the Baltic populations and other peoples, this disaster was avoided for many years. We who are dedicated to freedom owe these peoples a debt of gratitude.

The Estonian freedom fighters were engaged, in effect, in a two-front war: one against the Red army, which was trying to restore Imperial Russia's domination of the Baltic states, and another against a corps of German volunteers, who sought to turn Estonia into a German colony. These were turbulent times, but still one is struck by the cost of the war in terms of human life and property. Out of an Estonian army of more than 80,000 men, 3,588 were killed and 13,755 were wounded. This is a casualty rate of almost 30 percent, exclusive of the ravages inflicted upon the civilian population. Yet all this suffering was not in vain: the Soviet-Estonian Peace Treaty was signed on February 2, 1920, and the Estonians' struggle for independence was crowned with success.

During the 1920's the young republic continued to be the target of Communist subversion and infiltration. Indeed, in 1924 the Soviet Union openly prepared and directed a coup d'etat in the Estonian capital of Tallinn, in an effort to overthrow the existing democratic regime. Soviet troops were massed near the frontier ready to march into Estonia at the expected "invitation" or "appeal" of an insurgent government. Soviet designs, however, were frustrated. The Estonian Government suppressed the uprising and outlawed the Estonian Communist Party. Not until 1940, under the umbrella of the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, were the Soviets able to impose their will on this small Baltic State. Since World War II, Estonians have lived unwillingly but helplessly under the direct rule of the Soviet Union. Only charlatans could expect us to swallow the myth that this was a "voluntary" act of union with the U.S.S.R. The facts speak differently.

It is important to recall these events on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Estonian independence, for they remind us of the unfulfilled aspirations of the Estonians and millions of other Baltic citizens for freedom and national self-determination. We were tragically mistaken to think that the struggle for these goals ended with the proclamation of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and the establishment of the post-Versailles political order in Europe. To the contrary, the struggle against political, economic, and cultural subjugation continues. Of all oppressors in the past, the Soviet Union has offered the most obdurate and hypocritical resistance to the just demands of the Estonians and scores of other peoples. What is theirs by right is the opportunity to decide their own destinies in freedom.

KEATING URGES MORE REALISTIC BIPARTISAN CUBA POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it would be unfortunate if the debate on Cuba degenerated into a name calling, political brawl.

What the United States does or refrains from doing in regard to the Soviet base in Cuba may determine the peace and security of the whole world. We must consider this issue as Americans, not as Republicans or Democrats. And our goal must be to find solutions, not to develop campaign fodder for the coming elections.

Let it be conceded that the mistakes in Cuba go back many years to periods of Republican as well as Democratic administrations and that both parties bear a heavy responsibility for the tragic conditions which now exist in Cuba. Let it also be conceded that there are men and women in both parties equally dedicated to the task of ridding this hemisphere of its first Communist military base.

If there is a concerted campaign to exploit the present situation in Cuba for partisan purposes, I refuse to be, as I have refused to be, a participant in any such course. In fact, I have consistently refused to discuss the Cuban problem in political terms, although efforts have been made to goad me into that position. In January 1960, under the Eisenhower administration, I said:

> It is high time for a massive reappraisal of American policies toward Cuba.

In February 1960 I frankly declared:

> Cuba is Russia's and Red China's most noteworthy victim in the Caribbean.

By the same token, I hope that those who put the national interest first now will also repudiate any partisan campaign to discredit every suggestion for dealing with the Communist takeover in Cuba which does not emanate from the White House.

In recent weeks, I have had an opportunity to discuss the Cuban situation with both the Secretary of State and Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe it is correct to say that we all share basically the same view as to the objectives of U.S. policy in Cuba. The real challenge, however, is how to achieve those objectives. My recommendations for a course of action have been transmitted to the President, and I have every reason to believe that they are being given serious and sincere consideration. But in an area such as this, there is no one right course or plan and in my judgment it is very much in the national interest for many alternatives and proposals to be made and considered. That should be the function of the Senate's dialog on Cuba; and if this debate is carried on and viewed in that spirit, I am confident that it will enhance rather than undermine bipartisanship and strengthen rather than weaken our national resolve.

My own judgment is that Cuba is now the No. 1 testing ground in the struggle between international communism and the free world. This is not because of any fear of an invasion of the United States from Cuba, as some have said in an effort to belittle concern with the problem of Cuba. Did anyone fear an invasion of the United States from South Korea if it fell to the Chinese Reds? Does anyone now fear an invasion of the United States from South Vietnam if it should fall to the Communists? We have recognized in these areas and in such places as Greece and Turkey and Lebanon as well as in Berlin, that you cannot appease a tyrant, that the appetite of the Communists is insatiable, and that the only way to prevent the Communists from swallowing up the world piece by piece is to make sure they get indigestion every time they reveal their hunger pains.

Churchill was not acting the part of a warmonger when he uttered his prophetic warnings about Munich. Neither was Harry Truman when he committed the United States to the defense of South Korea, or Dwight D. Eisenhower when he ordered Marines to land in Lebanon, or John F. Kennedy when he took us to the brink of nuclear war during the October missile crisis. These men on those occasions recognized that retreat in the face of danger would increase the danger and multiply the likelihood of an eventual catastrophe. The real warmongers are not those who are determined to forestall aggression at every turn, but those who are ready to surrender to fear in every crisis.

No two situations are entirely alike and there are elements in the Cuban situation which certainly are unique. The Soviet takeover of Cuba was accomplished not by an invasion but by subversion. Obviously, this is a more difficult tactic to detect and forestall, but its consequences are no less grave or menacing. Hitler had his Quislings, and the Communists have their Castros not only in Cuba, but in many areas of the world. We cannot blind ourselves to conquest by subversion or covert aggression, anymore than we can to conquest by overt and naked aggression. The same loss of freedom and expansion of communism is involved in both cases and neither can be tolerated without imperiling world peace. If we condone what has happened in Cuba, how can we possibly prevent the same pattern from repeating itself in British Guiana, after it achieves independence, or in Venezuela or Brazil or Mexico, or in any other country in which Communist agents are busily at work?

It seems to me that the first ingredient of any effective policy with regard to Cuba is that we recognize the nature of the threat. There is no possibility of success in efforts to eliminate the Soviets and their military equipment from this hemisphere if we downgrade the implications of the Cuban takeover. Our allies cannot be expected to join in the kind of concerted action which is necessary to deal with this situation, if important figures in our own country portray the problem merely as an irritant or a nuisance, and indicate a readiness to accept the status quo. Our leaders must make clear, not only to all Americans, but to the whole world, that the Soviet takeover in Cuba presents, at the very least, the same threat to the peace, security, and freedom of the world as the attempted Red takeovers of South Korea, South Vietnam, and the Congo.

We have acted boldly and with great determination in all of those areas, and there is no reason for us to respond with any less vigor to a threat in our own hemisphere just off our own shores. I believe that our partners in the struggle against international communism would fully understand our concern with the Soviet base in Cuba if our views were effectively articulated and skillfully conveyed.

Mr. President, no effort to silence those who want to express their concern about the situation in Cuba today can possibly serve the national interest. The public will not be deceived by charges that Members of Congress are "hectoring"—one spokesman used that word, but I do not know exactly what he meant—the administration or that public discussion of the facts about Cuba gives aid and comfort to the Communists. They will no more be influenced by opportunist cries of "McCarthyism" than by an Izvestia's polemic against "rabid men" sitting in the U.S. Senate. No matter what slurs or insinuations are spread against those speaking out on the Communist menace in Cuba, and I am confident that they will continue to discuss the facts and problems involved in this critical area.

Mr. President, this is in no sense a repudiation of bipartisanship in foreign affairs. The truth is that there is no coherent and consistent policy toward Cuba to which to give bipartisan support. And the truth also is that members of both parties have joined in the criticism of efforts to downgrade the Communist threat in the Caribbean Sea.

I believe it would be more constructive to discuss the merits rather than the motives of this controversy, and that is what I intend to do today.

The dissatisfaction and uncertainty which are evident throughout the Nation today with regard to what is going on in Cuba and what it really means do not stem from congressional statements on the subject. The real cause for the crisis of confidence, the credibility gap, that exists widely throughout the Nation, lies in the complete failure of our Government leaders to articulate a clear and firm policy toward the Soviet takeover in Cuba. This is not a partisan issue or an attempt to lay the blame at anyone's door. As I have said, our mistakes in Cuba go back many years. When Castro came to power, many were unable to decide whether Castro was a Robin Hood or a Mao Tse-tung, whether we should greet him officially or see him privately, whether we should continue the Cuban sugar quota or cut it, or what exactly we should do.

Whatever reason there may have been for hesitation when Castro first came to power, surely events since the end of 1959 have made clear that Castro has sold out the Cuban people and has converted that island into a Soviet military base. It is clear, too, that Khrushchev is prepared to stay in Cuba as long as his position is tolerated. We would do well to put wishful thinking aside, and to face the facts as to what Communist Cuba means today.

The present crisis of confidence with respect to Cuba can be traced directly to an increasing disillusionment with the zigzag policy of improvisation which has characterized the executive branch's pronouncements on this subject. At times, the improvisation has been good, as it was last October, when our Government acknowledged that strategic missile systems were in Cuba, and responded with determination and boldness. At other times, such as the Bay of Pigs, our improvisation was disastrous. In the long run, this policy has inevitably tended to undermine national confidence.

Our zigzag policy over Cuba has left the people in doubt at times as to whether the Communist threat in Cuba was ever regarded as serious by Government officials. There is no need to dwell on past history. But it is interesting to recall that one of the principal reasons given for the Bay of Pigs invasion at the time was the arrival and imminent deployment of a great supply of Soviet weapons, including among them Mig's. In other words, in the early months of 1961, our Government officials were sufficiently concerned over the presence of Mig's in Cuba to proceed with a plan for even military action against Castro. Yet, today we are told that the same Mig's—in fact, even later and better models than those available to Castro in April 1961—are no cause for concern and no threat whatsoever to the United States or to our Latin American friends.

After the Bay of Pigs invasion, the significance of these and other Soviet weapons in Cuba was strongly downgraded. Our policy shifted abruptly. Instead of being a terrible menace, Soviet forces in Cuba were said to be merely a nuisance, and it was said that Castro would wither on the vine if the United States simply ignored him. As a result, for nearly a year after the Bay of Pigs, there was no genuine attempt to put economic pressure on Castro. There was no trade embargo, and there was very little effort to discourage anyone else from aiding or trading with Castro. Our Cuba policy was no policy; we were just to wait and see what would happen next.

Requests for State Department guidance during that period received polite replies indicating that the matter of trade restrictions was being studied, but conclusions were never reached. The standard reply went something like this letter to me, dated July 7, 1961:

> The Department [of State] appreciates your continuing interest in this matter and, as you know, shares your concern that the hostile Castro regime continues to derive benefits from trading with the United States, although on a greatly reduced scale. I can assure you that the administration has the question of Cuban-United States trade relations under intensive study. A final decision on this matter, however, has not been reached at this writing.

Mr. President, the United States did not lift a finger to put an embargo into effect until February of 1962.

The next important development was the intensive Soviet military buildup which began in July of 1962. When I indicated, in a very conservative way, the extent of this buildup and the threat which it offered, I was confronted by a barrage of denials and attacks from various Government spokesmen. These included a written denial from the State Department, dated August 30—I repeat that its date was August 30—stating:

> We have no information that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba.

To confuse the issue even more, at the same time when we were thus told that there was no evidence "that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba," other Government sources were claiming, in so-called background press briefings, that the buildup had already been fully revealed. Now, of course, it is admitted that the Soviet buildup was increasing steadily during that period.

I indicated during the same period that Soviet amphibious vehicles were in Cuba. This also was promptly denied by official sources, only to be later confirmed.

When it was suggested that the Soviets might be attempting to link Cuba and Berlin, and devise some kind of a deal to offer the United States in this regard, a virtual tirade of criticism was unleased; but in due course these same critics were contending that the United States must take a more moderate position in Cuba, lest we invite a retaliation on the Western position on Berlin. This new line of reasoning, publicly endorsed by the President, lasted for only about 1 month, at which time it became undeniably clear that the Soviets were putting missiles in Cuba, and did, indeed, hope to gain in Berlin by threatening us from Cuba.

On October 10, when I disclosed information which I had received regarding the construction of medium range missile bases, there were again vigorous denials—not only by public affairs officers, who probably did not know any better, but also by top Government officials, who should be presumed to have known the facts.

In a forthcoming book about Cuba, the statement is made:

> From early August [the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John] McCone had been warning the administration that the Kremlin might try to plant offensive missiles in Cuba.

It is my understanding that this book, which will be published shortly, was cleared with the White House, Department of Defense, and Central Intelligence Agency.

And only now are we publicly told by Secretary McNamara that these missiles arrived on the island of Cuba as early as the middle of September, but without being perceived or reported by American intelligence sources, and that intermediate range bases were also under construction.

When the President finally confronted the Nation with the Soviet missile threat in Cuba, the entire country united behind him and applauded his firm action in forcing withdrawal of the missiles and Ilyushin bombers. The country stood 100 percent behind the President's policies in this crisis and the Soviets backed down.

I well remember where I was on the night of October 22. I was addressing the largest meeting that had ever been held in the city in New York State where I was then speaking. I was addressing a partisan crowd. I had released an address. I scrapped it entirely and devoted my entire effort that evening to a speech in support of the President of the United States in the great crisis which our Nation faced.

Unfortunately, we failed to press our advantage and were unwilling to insist on on-site inspection to make certain that the Soviets were living up to their agreement. As a result of this improvisation of policy, there is doubt again as to just what the Soviets are doing in Cuba.

It is not hard to understand why the American people are confused when they are first told that on-site inspection is essential and then that no such inspection is needed. Let me quote a statement made by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric on November 11, 1962. When he was asked how the United States could be certain that the Soviets left no missiles behind without on-site inspection, Mr. Gilpatric replied:

> We never knew how many missiles were brought into Cuba. The Soviets said there were 42. We have counted 42 going out. We saw fewer than 42. Until we have so-called on-site inspection of the island of Cuba, we could never be sure that 42 was the maximum number that the Soviets brought into Cuba.

Contrast with that statement Secretary McNamara's unqualified assurance that our security is being fully safeguarded without on-site inspection. In his nationwide television presentation, Secretary McNamara declared:

> I am satisfied that there are no major elements of offensive weapons systems in the caves of Cuba. It is unlikely beyond any reasonable doubt that offensive weapons systems equipment could not (sic) have been unloaded and moved into caves without our detection.

And yet he did not deny that the Government had no record of the number of missiles originally brought to Cuba. And it is a fact even now that U.S. knowledge of the cargo of certain vessels landing in Cuba is considerably less than we would like. The Director of the CIA made his position clear when he admitted that without on-site inspection, we can have no absolute assurances that these missiles have been completely removed.

The changing winds of an inconsistent policy also have blown the shipping question in every direction. First, as I have noted, there was an inordinate delay in the imposition of an embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba. As the Soviet military buildup proceeded through the months of August, September, and October of last year, some informal efforts were made to alert our NATO friends or the rest of the free world that this shipping was a threat to the security of the United States and our Western Hemisphere allies. Prior to the imposition of the quarantine in late October, it was widely reported that Government regulations were being drawn up to restrict these shipments, but nothing was done until the beginning of February. Finally, a limited order was announced applying only to the shipping of U.S. Government cargoes from the United States in ships which have visited Cuba since January 1, 1963. This was a step in the right direction, but it is far too early to assess the results now. High officials have said that none of the 12 free world ships which stopped in Cuba in January picked up any U.S. goods—but since the east coast shipping strike did not end until January 26, the fact is not very significant. Shipping data for February, not yet available, should be more revealing. It is, of course, my hope that none of those ships coming in February to supply Castro have been able to profit by taking back cargo from the United States.

Moreover, if our Government really wishes to make shipping more difficult for the Soviet Union and to put a tight economic squeeze on Soviet efforts in Cuba, it should welcome the cooperation of such groups as the International Longshoremen's Association. Our officials should throw their arms around these public-spirited union members who are prepared to sacrifice a measure of their own economic well-being for the sake of a firm U.S. move against communism. The cooperation of the longshoremen is invaluable, but instead of seeking such cooperation, the Department of State is in the peculiar position of berating and restraining a union for attempting to carry out in a determined manner a policy that the State Department is itself carrying out with apparent timidity.

Another area of doubt and uncertainty has been created because of the announced withdrawal of land-based American missiles from Turkey and Italy. When this decision was publicly announced, after a few unfortunate leaks had appeared in the press, it was officially stated that these missile bases were becoming obsolete and that they would be more than replaced by an increase in the Polaris fleet of missile-bearing submarines. This may be sound but it does not jibe with statements made by the Defense Department officials before the Cuban crisis was resolved. For instance, on November 11, Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric declared:

> We don't contemplate closing down any of our foreign bases or oversea bases. I consider all bases we have today as important to us. Our whole NATO base structure is the foundation of our planning both as a—as our national forces and the NATO forces and therefore we have no thought of giving up any of our oversea bases. As of now we need all the weapons we have deployed.

These very strong statements were followed by articles reputedly detailing the inside story of what went on in the White House during the week of the Cuban crisis. These stories criticized Government officials for "Munich" like suggestions that the Turkish and Italian bases be traded in exchange for a Soviet missile withdrawal from Cuba. Naturally, I have no personal knowledge of what went on there, but against this

background, is it surprising that doubts have been raised about the proposed withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy? The whole sequence of events raises questions which cannot be avoided.

Let us consider finally the question of Castro-based subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere. First, let us recall the statement made in a fine and stirring speech by the President of the United States directly following the Bay of Pigs invasion:

> The message of Cuba, of Laos, of the rising din of Communist voices in Asia and Latin America—these messages are all the same. The complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies are to be swept away with the debris of history. Only the strong, only the industrious, only the visionary can survive. No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. No other challenge is more deserving of our every effort and energy. Too long we have fixed our eyes on traditional military needs, on armies prepared to cross borders or missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear that this is no longer enough—that our security may be lost without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Again I characterize that as a fine speech and statement by the President of the United States.

On January 31, I declared on the Senate floor:

> What the Soviets are planning to do—in fact they are already doing it—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion, and agitation throughout Latin America. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, clearly and demonstrably are the work of Communists training and armed in Cuba.

Shortly after my statement, on February 6, Defense Secretary McNamara, in a nationally televised appearance witnessed by millions, was asked specifically about the use of Cuba as a training base for subversion or sabotage. At that time, he made the incredible reply:

> I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries.

Yet barely a week later, my statement was fully supported and amplified in a 58-page report presented by the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

And then compare the categorical assurances of the Secretary of Defense—that there was no evidence of the export of subversion or sabotage—also with the testimony of the Secretary of State, and the Director of the CIA, further detailing Cuba's attempts to subvert other Latin American countries. Until Secretary McNamara repudiates his statement and admits that he was wrong, confusion and doubt are bound to continue.

When the nations of this hemisphere first met at Punta del Este 1 year ago, the United States did take the lead in pressing for an embargo between Cuba and the other nations of this hemisphere. Our effort to win Latin American cooperation at that time petered out into a mere statement of condemnation.

And the Punta del Este Conference was generally recognized as not having accomplished very much. But one of the achievements that can be traced to that Conference—practically the only one of substance—was the creation of a committee within the Organization of American States to study the problem of subversion and to make recommendations for action. Now the report has been prepared. The report finally was released last Friday. Ironically, however, it now appears that the United States discouraged the full release of this report, an act which raises the most serious questions about our present confidence and support for the OAS.

Last year, the OAS was criticized for not taking a stronger stand against Castro before the missile crisis.

Those of us who were urging a stronger stand were constantly told, "You can't take a stronger stand because the Latin American countries will not back you up." When the crisis came in October and November, OAS support for the United States was strong and unanimous. Now, a hesitant U.S. policy over this report, over the shipping question, and over the matter of subversion, and other incidents, has weakened the resolve of the OAS. What we should be following is a consistent U.S. policy of mobilizing OAS cooperation in meeting the peril in Cuba, and this is not helped at all by any downgrading of the Cuban threat.

The significance of the 17,000—which is the figure given by the Government officials—Soviet military personnel in Cuba has also been the subject of conflicting interpretations. At first, it was denied that there were any Soviet troops in Cuba. Only after 5,000 had been withdrawn was it conceded that over 22,000 military troops and technicians were known to have been in Cuba at the time of the missile crisis. This is a figure far beyond any figure ever used by me or by others, so far as I know.

In his press conference on February 14, the President suggested that the Soviet technicians or military or paramilitary people in Cuba may be participating in training programs, training other Latins for subversion. It has also been suggested that the Soviet troops may still be in Cuba for the purpose of training Cubans in the operation of some of the weapons systems which remain in that country. For some reason—unknown to me—this is regarded as less of a danger than other activities which they might be undertaking. Yet, throughout the missile crisis, we were told that at least we could take some comfort from the fact that the Soviet retained the medium and intermediate missile facilities completely under their own control. We were told to take comfort from the fact that Khrushchev was a reasonable man who would not plunge the world into nuclear warfare. Now, we are being told to take comfort from the fact that the Soviets have remained in Cuba not to man the new weapons but to train Cubans in their operation and maintenance. Frankly, I cannot take comfort in anything but a complete withdrawal of the Soviets from this hemisphere.

Moreover, I cannot take much comfort from the new effort some Government officials are now making to silence criticism again on the grounds that Khrushchev has already promised to withdraw some of his troops and that continued discussion of the situation may lead him to change his mind. To my mind, this is a complete misreading of events. If Khrushchev has actually promised to withdraw several thousand troops—and we cannot be sure until the text of the note is published and the troops are actually back in the Soviet Union—it will be because of vocal American objections and outrage, not in spite of it. Khrushchev retreats only when he feels the pressure upon him is becoming intolerable. A determined American Nation, vocal in criticism of Soviet imperialism and strong in pressure for action, has always carried more weight with Khrushchev than diplomatic notepassing.

Khrushchev and his emissaries may well say that the present discussion of the Cuban situation makes it difficult for him to withdraw. That is what we would expect of him. But how can anyone familiar with recent history accept this line? Since when has Khrushchev or any other dictator yielded to a policy of appeasement? It is not what we do not say or do not threaten to do that makes an impression on him; it is what he sees we actually mean and will do that persuades him to move, either backward or forward, depending on his interpretation of our intent.

What we have lacked most in Cuba is a long term, consistent, and effective policy for ridding this hemisphere of Soviet conquest. When such a policy is enunciated, it will not lack support from either side of the aisle in this Chamber, or from any segment of the American people. Until that time, however, disunity and national concern are unavoidable. Suggestions by Government spokesmen that the Government has the right to lie on certain occasions of course shake public confidence and aggravate our uncertainty. Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester would perform a great service to the Government and American people if he would repudiate this managed news philosophy and restore faith in what our Government's spokesmen say.

To date, some Government officials appear to be more intent in demonstrating that the Assistant Secretary's cynicism was justified. The news has been managed, not only in the moment of crisis, when secret preparations may at time be necessary, but in the weeks and even months before and following the crisis. This management has been obvious even though sometimes indirect. A variety of so-called inside facts are planted designed to play up the drama of events and to play down the inaccurate assessments that made 11th hour action necessary. All the while, there is an attempt to belittle those warning of the continuing Communist threat in Cuba.

I strongly believe in a bipartisan foreign policy. My whole record in this body and the other body demonstrates that. And when the President takes action, either successfully as in October or unsuccessfully as at the Bay of Pigs, he can expect bipartisan support without recriminations of any kind. But there

has to be a policy before anyone can complain about a lack of bipartison support. When no action is taken, when no policy is followed other than wait and see, there is absolutely no basis for criticizing Members of Congress of either party for offering their views on this issue.

One Senator who now loudly complains about bipartisanship had this to say in 1961:

> The possibility of Soviet missile bases and jet aircraft bases in Cuba is frequently noted. I suppose we would all be less comfortable if the Soviets did install missile bases in Cuba, but I am not sure that our national existence would be in substantially greater danger. Nor do I think that such bases would substantially alter the balance of power in the world.

Another senatorial critic of the critics said this on September 11, 1962:

> So I do not want the people of my State to lose a night's sleep worrying about the might of Cuba. It is misleading and mischievous to say that Cuba represents a military threat to the United States. Castro can triple or quadruple his imports of Soviet technicians and arms without requiring us to assign a single additional destroyer or fighter squadron to our Caribbean forces.

This was a month and 11 days before October 22, when the President spoke out.

I hope that the Cuba debate will continue. I believe that it will offer enlightenment to those who will listen whether or not they agree with all that they hear. Of course, we must weigh our words with care and do whatever possible to strengthen the President's hand. That is the course I have followed in the past and the course I shall continue to follow until I am convinced that the Communist threat to the peace and security of this hemisphere has been removed.

Whatever our differences in the means to be used, the American people are united in the end to be achieved—peace. But we do not want the peace of communism, the peace of the totalitarian state, the peace of the grave; we want a peace where freedom can flourish and where men can differ without the need to silence their differences by bringing in thousands of troops and establishing missile bases.

The best way to achieve that peace, as we saw only too well from the dismal efforts of the 1930's, is not by appeasement, and not by a policy of retreat that can only encourage the Soviets to attack us elsewhere. Certainly, one of the big lessons of the Cuban crisis of October, for Berlin, and for the rest of the world, is that a strong and determined stand by the United States can ultimately ease tensions. It can show the Soviets that we mean what we say. It can show them that they have nothing to gain by belligerent activities.

In the long run it is paradoxical, but true, that the real peacemakers of this world are not the Neville Chamberlains and the Pierre Lavals who try to make accommodations with an unscrupulous aggressor, but the Winston Churchills, who see the danger in time.

Peace is not something that the Soviets are ever going to give us. It is something that we and the whole free world have to win, through policies which prove to the Soviets beyond doubt that they have nothing to gain by hostility or provocation.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I listened with great interest to the speech of the Senator from New York, as I always do to the speeches he makes on any subject, and most especially in recent months to what he has had to say relative to the Cuban situation.

I am glad that he states he believes in a bipartisan foreign policy, and, of course, I take him at his word, and I know when he says he believes the President's hand should be strengthened he will do what he can in that respect to give him his support.

I did not hear all the Senator's speech, although I was in the Chamber most of the afternoon, but I believe in the beginning he said something about this administration's improvising in the field of foreign policy——

Mr. KEATING. In the Cuban situation. I was dealing only with that facet of foreign policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept the correction. But I would point out to the Senator that it is pretty hard to lay down a hard and fast policy as to any part of the world where we have difficulties; there are areas in the world which call for discernment on the part of the President, and demand action along various lines from time to time.

The Senator knows better than I do that, in addition to the cancer of Cuba, there is the question of unrest and dissatisfaction, and revolutions of sorts, in Latin America. He knows the situation in Africa is far from settled. He knows the Western alliance is going through some agonizing reconsiderations at the moment.

He knows the situation in the Middle East is quite difficult, especially in view of the recent revolts in Yemen and that country's tie-ups with Egypt. He knows of the more recent revolt in Iraq and the possibility of a tie-up between that country and Egypt. He knows of the delicate situation in south Asia, where we find the Pakistanis and the Indians meeting over the question of Kashmir. He knows of the situation between the Indians and the Chinese, resulting from the Chinese aggression of last fall.

We see the situation in southeast Asia, where we have something like 12,000 troops in South Vietnam.

We know of the precarious situation in Laos, whose King, Sri Savang Vatana, honors us with a state visit today. We know of the ever-present danger in the Formosan Straits, to Taiwan, and the ever-present danger in Korea, where we have two military divisions stationed this side of the 38th parallel.

These are matters which the President—not merely President Kennedy, but any President—must contend with during his tenure of office. These are problems no President can throw back on his predecessor, nor should he, because once he assumes office he assumes full responsibility.

But it is difficult to lay down a hard-and-fast policy in one area in view of the way conditions in the world are changing today.

While the Senator from New York may not have said so, he indicated that there was a question raised at a time subsequent to the Cuban crisis of a "deal" which would cover both Cuba and Berlin. I say that, to the best of my knowledge, there never was any deal. I say also—and I am glad to see the assistant minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], in the Chamber—that when we met with the President on October 22 at his request, and came back here from all parts of the country—the Senator from California, I believe, came back from the Pacific coast—the leadership was then told what the facts were, and there was a strong possibility raised that the reaction might well be against Berlin. We understood that perfectly. We understood all the implications involved. We understood that if anything happened at Berlin, this country would almost certainly be engaged in nuclear war. The people knew it, too.

Most important, Mr. Khrushchev knew it. And because of that, these missile sites were destroyed and the IRBM, the medium-range ballistic missiles, were withdrawn.

I note that the Senator stated—and I hope I am not taking too much of his time, because I did not hear all of his speech—that on October 10 he warned of the IRBM's on Cuba and that the information was not given to the American people or to the leadership until 12 days later—which is correct; but I would point out that when the leadership was called back to Washington on the 22d of October, we were told by the President that on the preceding Tuesday, when he had received his information from the Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. John McCone, he had ordered more photo reconnaissance, flown at lower levels, to make absolutely certain that the initial information given to him was accurate.

When he was absolutely sure in his mind, he sent out a call to both the Republican and the Democratic leadership. We did not know what it was all about. We came back to Washington and we were told the facts at that time.

I am sure that even though the Senator from New York made the statement, as he says, on October 10, that there were ICBM's on the island of Cuba——

Mr. KEATING. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I did not say that there were missiles there. I said there were medium-range missile sites under construction.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Medium-range missile sites under construction. I accept the correction. If I remember correctly, the 22d was Monday. Therefore Sunday was the 21st, Saturday the 20th, Friday the 19th, Thursday the 18th, and that it was on the 16th of October that the President received his first information from Mr. McCone. It was on the following Sunday, the 21st, that he finally corroborated that information and was absolutely certain in his own mind that it was correct.

It was on that day that he sent out the call for the leadership to come to Washington.

On the next day he laid the story before us, and that evening he laid it before the American people.

In the meantime, when he received his first information on October 16, he immediately ordered the Strategic Air Command on an ever-ready alert. He also ordered the embarkation of marines at Pendleton, Calif. When the leadership met with the President on Monday, those marines, if my memory serves me correctly, were at sea for 4 days on the way through the canal, and from there, of course, they would go to the Caribbean.

The Director of Central Intelligence, a man for whom I have great admiration and respect, did notify the President at the first chance and did bring to him all available information he had at his disposal.

I mentioned the fact that on the 22d the leaders on both sides were called in by the President.

The leadership on both sides was called in many times before October 22, and the latest time we were called in, from both sides, was one day last week.

The Senator from New York said, in effect, that Mr. Gilpatrick and Mr. McNamara made certain statements about onsite inspections; that Under Secretary Gilpatrick is supposed to have said, "We are never sure," and that Secretary McNamara was quoted as having said he was "reasonably satisfied."

I see nothing wrong with these statements attributed to Mr. Gilpatrick and Mr. McNamara. They, too, depend on the same kind of information upon which the President depends, and that is furnished by Mr. McCone as coordinator of all intelligence activities. That means that the intelligence activities of the Defense Department are brought to Mr. McCone's attention.

I wonder who is ever sure that he is right about such things. I wonder if Secretary McNamara, in stating he was "reasonably satisfied" was not in fact making an accurate and honest statement. I am sure he was. Unfortunately, it is true that onsite inspection has not come about, but I believe it is also true that on a daily basis further reconnaissance is taking place, and we are as well aware of what is going on on the island of Cuba as we can be, minus onsite inspection.

The Senator from New York mentioned the longshoremen embargo on certain ships.

I invite the Senator's attention to a fact which I learned in the civics course, namely, that the conduct of the foreign policy of this country is in the hands of the President of the United States, who delegates that authority on occasion to the Secretary of State, and is not in the hands of a labor union. I think that ought to be kept in mind.

There are limits as to what should and should not be done. The President and the Secretary of State conduct American foreign policy.

The Senator also mentioned something about the withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy, and said that such withdrawal is at odds with previous Defense Department statements. Of course it is. The matter of withdrawing Jupiter missiles from Italy and Turkey was considered long before the Cuban crisis of last October. Certainly nothing was to be said at that time which would indicate that the Jupiter missiles were to be withdrawn, just as the Thor missiles were to be withdrawn from England, and were to be replaced by the Polaris missile. I believe the administration acted in good faith at that time and that the Defense Department made the only kind of statement that could have been made. Very likely because of the Cuban crisis the Jupiter missiles were maintained, in Italy and Turkey especially, longer than they would have been, because of the critical situation which arose.

The Senator also mentioned something about the note which Mr. Khrushchev sent to the President, and he indicated, not some doubt about it, but that he had not seen its contents. The text of the Khrushchev note, not to the President, but to the State Department, was read in part at the leadership meeting last week. It was read several times. It was indicated in that note that it was the intention of the Soviet Union to withdraw "several thousand" of the Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will permit me to inquire at that point—and I would not want him to answer me at all if he feels he should not—I should like to ask whether Khrushchev's statement was that they intended to withdraw them or that they promised to withdraw those troops?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That question I could not answer definitely, to be honest about it. I do not believe it was a hard and fast promise. As I recall, it was something pretty close to that.

I would not even be mentioning this today, and I know the Senator would not be either, if the news story had not appeared the next day after this so-called secret meeting. I must confess in all honesty that I cannot specifically answer the question of the Senator in that respect.

The Senator says that we lack a long-term consistent policy in Cuba. It is hard to develop a long-term consistent policy in any part of the world. Events make the most careful policies of little use to us. As I indicated in the earlier part of my remarks, I wish it were possible to lay down a pat policy, to operate it on a checks-and-balance basis, and to be sure that the policy, in spite of changing situations, would be successful.

I point out—and the Senator knows this better than I—that the United States has become the leader of the free world, not from choice, not because it sought the role, but because of necessity—in other words, it had no choice.

We shall make some mistakes as we go along. We have made plenty so far, and we will make some in the future. However, I believe we are learning, too.

Of course I agree with the Senator that there should be no appeasement and no retreat. I agree with him on the fine words he has to say about one of the world's great statesmen, Winston Churchill. However, I would also say that in the Presidency we have a man of courage, tenacity, and understanding, a man who is learning a good deal about some of the problems the hard way, a man who will make mistakes on occasion, but a man who always has the interest of the United States at heart first.

He is the man who will look after the best interests, the security, and the well-being of not only the 185 million Americans who live in this country, his own fellow citizens, but also of the people who live in countries which are dependent, through alliances and other arrangements, on the United States.

So I hope that the Senator from New York will continue to be constructive in his statements. I am glad he has said that he believes in a bipartisan foreign policy. I am sure he does. I am glad he has said he will do what he can to strengthen the President's hand. I believe we ought to think of our own country first, and never America last. I believe that all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—have that thought in mind. If we criticize, as Democrats have done under a Republican administration, and as Republicans have criticized, and will continue to criticize, under a Democratic administration, I hope that the criticism will be constructive and that where fault is found, alternatives will be offered. I feel, deep down in my heart, that that will be the attitude of the Republican critics; and I feel also that they will not attack the President or his policy in Cuba, or elsewhere, merely for the sake of criticizing.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me and giving me the opportunity to make this statement at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the distinguished majority leader for his comments. I am sure he does not need to be told that at no time in any of my comments on the Cuban situation was one word ever uttered impugning the motives, the patriotism, or the sincerity of the President of the United States or any other Government leader who might differ with my position.

Furthermore, I am sure the Senator from Montana, who is familiar with my record both in the Senate and in the other body, knows that I am completely sincere when I say that I believe in and have always supported a bipartisan foreign policy. No one has ever suggested, however, that a bipartisan foreign policy requires us to refrain from all discussion of our foreign policy and I have not hesitated to criticize when a Republican President was in the White House, if I felt criticism was justified—and there were times when I felt it was; and I think it is proper to criticize now when criticism is justified. Of course, many Senators on the other side of the aisle have, in deed and in fact, criticized certain aspects of our present policy. The distinguished majority leader himself has been critical of the lack of a sound, long-term policy in southeast Asia, to give one example.

I agree that at times, we must, improvise. I pointed out in my speech—and I call this to the attention of the Senator from Montana, because he said

he did not hear all that I said—instances in which I considered the improvisation good, and instances in which I thought it was bad.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall the Senator doing that. I was speaking in general terms.

Mr. KEATING. But I also think we need basic guidelines of policy. We need to know how we plan to deal with particular problems on a long-range basis, whether to ignore them or devise long range and immediate means to combat them. Frankly, I think some of our efforts to gain the support and cooperation of our allies in Latin America and of our NATO allies in a long-range policy with respect to the Cuban situation have been disappointing. I believe that concerted action at the very least should be vigorously attempted. I hope it will succeed.

I believe it will succeed if it is properly presented. In doing so, the worst thing in the world is to try to downgrade the crisis and downgrade the Soviet buildup in Cuba. If the news with reference to the crisis in Cuba is to be managed, it might better be done by building up the Soviet menace rather than downgrading it, but there is no need to exaggerate any of the facts to convince the world of the serious implications of the present situation.

The Senator from Montana referred to alternatives. I agree with him that those who are critical of a particular policy, normally should be prepared to advance constructive alternatives. That is exactly what the junior Senator from New York has done. My recommendations for dealing with this crisis have been presented to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who stated he came to me at the request of the President.

I have given him my recommendations—which certainly are not infallible—for dealing with this situation. None of these recommendations involves military action against Cuba. Last Wednesday I received a call from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, indicating that the President felt that at this time it might be harmful to the national interest to have those recommendations made public. When the Commander in Chief makes a statement like that to a Senator, I believe it is entitled to respect. Therefore, I have not made public the recommendations which I have transmitted to the President.

Most of the other points made by the distinguished Senator from Montana are dealt with in my remarks. One point I would like to emphasize, however, is that there is no desire on the part of the junior Senator from New York to belittle a crisis anywhere in the world or to indicate that the resolution of any of these problems is easy. It is not easy; it is difficult. But in my judgment, firm action in Cuba is more likely to prevent such crises than a position of weakness. I believe the results of the October confrontation proved this conclusively.

I now wish to say a word concerning the reference to the Longshoremen's Union. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Montana that we cannot leave the determination of our foreign policy to a labor union.

But when a labor union takes what it believes to be a public-spirited position in regard to the handling of Communist cargo, I believe that instead of being pilloried and attacked, it might be more in the interest of our country if the union were called in, and if the matter were discussed with the union. Certainly it was voicing general sentiment among many of the people of this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Relative to the attitude of the Longshoremen's Union, I would agree with the latter part of the Senator's statement; namely, that there should be discussion of these matters, there should be consideration of the foreign policy of our country, and there should also be recognition as to where the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy lies.

As for the Longshoremen's Union being pilloried, I had not heard of that; this is the first indication I have had that anything of that sort was happening to the Longshoremen's Union. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that I have heard more praise of the union than anything else.

But let me point out the difficulty: If a Longshoremen's Union or any other union can operate on this basis, what is there to prevent a businessman's union or a housewives' union, or some other union from operating in the same way? Is a businessman's union or a housewives' union to conduct the foreign policy of our country? The Constitution clearly states that the President of the United States is the one who has that responsibility; and the one who acts for him is the Secretary of State.

Even Senators are circumscribed to some extent, because the power of the Senate in the field of foreign policy was set forth quite clearly in the Constitution. Although that power of the Senate has been broadened in recent years, it has been broadened, not because of what the Constitution states or does not state, but because of the fact that our country has become the world's major power, and also because of the fact that, as the years pass, control of the purse strings is becoming more and more important in connection with foreign policy.

So, Mr. President, although I would not wish to disagree with the statement the Senator from New York has just made, I would point out that too many foreign-policy cooks can spoil the broth, and the result of that would not be beneficial either to our country or to the rest of the free world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I agree that we could not have a labor union or a businessman's group or any other group of private individuals determine our foreign policy. But my recollection of the position taken by the longshoremen is that it was in accordance with our announced policy to discourage other nations from supplying Castro. I believe that voluntary organizations can do a great deal of good in support of an announced policy.

The announced policy of our Government was not being wholeheartedly carried out by our Government. Perhaps the longshoremen went too far; but they "picked up the ball," which seemed to many to have been dropped by the Government in carrying out its own policy. Sometimes the Government announces a policy, but then is not too careful about enforcing it.

I know that the Senator from Montana would—as would almost any other Senator—recognize that when Congress passes a foreign aid bill which contains some of the "sense of the Congress" amendments, we mean that we expect that they will be lived up to, although we are not tying the hands of the administrators of the program. But many times, Mr. President, after a policy of that sort has been announced, after the measure has been signed by the President, and after it is said that that is the announced policy of the Government, still what is done could not be recognized as a part of that Government policy. Such instances have occurred during previous administrations—namely, that after Congress passes a foreign aid bill containing certain "sense of the Congress" provisions, it is found that that is the end of any action on that score.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a brief comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rather like the phrase "loyal opposition," which is used in the Government of the United Kingdom to describe the party out of power. I think it actually means about the same as the old American axiom that "politics stop at the water's edge." For, Mr. President, the liberty which you and I enjoy in this country is not partisan in nature, and the responsibility to defend it must be exercised by all our countrymen, Republicans and Democrats, and all others.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York has served this country in peace and in war. He has spoken out firmly and honorably, time and time again, in regard to the grave and dangerous problem in Cuba and elsewhere, as he has seen the light. Today, once again, he has made a great contribution in the comments which have been made by him on this floor.

I, myself, hope to speak later on some of these problems; but at this time I wish to refer briefly to my colleague's comments. I speak as an American, not as a partisan. My comments would be exactly the same if I sat on the side on which my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] sits.

The distinguished Senator from New York recalls the comment made last November by a responsible, able, patriotic

member of the executive branch of the Government; namely, a comment in regard to missile bases maintained for a lengthy period of time overseas, by agreement with the European countries involved, because the maintenance of those bases was deemed to be in the interest of the defense of those countries and also in the interest of the defense of our own country. The comment made by a very able American—the Deputy Secretary of Defense—was, "Those bases are not going to be closed down." But shortly thereafter, Mr. President, we were told that they were going to be closed down.

I am no military expert. I come here as a lay Senator. But it is difficult for me, and, I think, for the American people to understand an abrupt change of that sort; and I congratulate my friend, the Senator from New York, for talking about it.

I returned to the capital of our country last October when the White House asked me to. I was asked to do so because I have been permitted by my Republican colleagues to be their whip. There was then a magnificent exhibition by Americans representing the legislative branch of the Government of the United States, both those who belong to the Democratic Party and those who belong to the Republican Party. Our people stood together in time of danger.

Mr. President, certainly no one in this country has any greater bitterness than does this Senator when he recalls that the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union told our President a falsehood in the White House, when he told the President of the United States, "We do not have in Cuba any weapons that are offensive in character, and we do not contemplate having in Cuba any weapons offensive in character." He made a false statement—indeed, several—to our President.

When the junior Senator from New York comments in his speech that the leader of our Government is the President of the United States, whether he belongs to one party or the other, he is eternally correct. We need to weigh our words with care. We must do whatever is possible to strengthen the hand of the President. For that reason, a year ago the distinguished Senator from New York indicated in the Senate that the time had come to write into law a prohibition against American trade and shipping with the infamous Castro regime, so far as it lay within the power of the American people through their Congress to prevent it. The Senator from New York was on the floor of the Senate last year, fighting for proposed legislation which is now the law of our land in the amendments that were written into the Mutual Security Act to prevent such shipping.

The Senator from New York was on the floor of the Senate, acting not as a partisan, but as an American when the resolution relating to Cuba passed the Congress, stating to the American people and to the world that the legislative branch of the Government of the United States was behind the commander in chief of our country in a policy of firmness, indicating that the American people and the American Government would not and will not tolerate any attempt to convert that unhappy and disgraced Communist island into a launching pad for nuclear weapons. Communism must be extirpated from this hemisphere.

I share the inward pride of every Senator and every other American in our country when I recall that the President of the United States, in his message last October, said with firmness that our country would hold the Soviet Union responsible if missiles were launched from Cuba against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

There will not be any carping criticism in the Senate on this side of the aisle. At any rate, there should not be. There will be constructive criticism, I hope and believe.

I have listened with great interest to the vigorous and searching comments that the Senator from New York has made today. I want particularly to point out the almost nonsequitur with respect to one of our defense policy decisions—or announcements—only to see it, apparently, overruled a short time thereafter. We want our country strong so that it may remain free. I trust my Government to act as it believes is in the best interest of our people, but the missile base situation in Europe, the seeming switch is most puzzling. I salute the Senator from New York for getting up and saying so—to indicate that we share an apprehension caused by statements which are made on one day to indicate a certain course of action and to find subsequently that a diametrically opposed course of action is to be followed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from California for his comments.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. It was my good fortune to be present in the Senate Chamber last August, when the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] made his speech notifying the Senate, and I think the Nation, of the presence of Soviet troops and offensive weapons in Cuba. Others have spoken on the subject since that time.

Because the statement of the Senator from New York at that time turned out to be correct, I have followed everything he has said with great interest and confidence. I believe that the facts have demonstrated that when the Senator from New York has spoken, he has done so on the basis of careful study and of knowledge.

I have said here and in other places that I thought the Senator has always spoken responsibly and I think that responsibility is necessary. I pay my tribute to the Senator because he has spoken with a desire to be responsible and constructive.

The Senator from New York has spoken of bipartisanship. There is always debate about what bipartisanship means. Opinion in the country has been aroused in this case, I believe, because of the obvious fact of Cuba's proximity, the missile threat last fall, and the continuing uncertainty aroused by the presence of Soviet troops.

Bipartisanship can bear upon this situation, and be helpful in strengthening policy and supporting the President in his decisions. The first condition of bipartisan support is the responsibility of the administration to provide to the people, and to the Congress, the greatest amount of information possible within the limits of security. I always feel better if the information comes directly from the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, rather than from news articles based on information perhaps supplied by the administration. Not knowing the source, we cannot really say that it is correct or incorrect.

So I believe the first responsibility for bipartisanship is that of the administration. Then I believe responsibility attaches to all of us.

There is great temptation to speak on the subject of Cuba, because we know that it is a serious situation. But there is also a responsibility to be constructive about it.

I believe a policy could be developed to deal with the problem of Cuba. Two weeks ago today, in one of the few speeches I have made on the subject, I suggested that for the immediate future the crux of policy is to urge the withdrawal of the Soviet troops and this the President is doing. Then, I suggested we should develop a policy in relation to the hemisphere, which would exclude Soviet bases.

We know the means for the implementation of policy are in the hands of the Executive. And thus another important element of bipartisanship comes into play. The President must have elbow room, as the majority leader said the other day. He must have the elements of maneuverability, so that the United States will not be forced into a position in which it could find no alternative except war, unless our security is absolutely at stake. Today, I believe the Congress must afford the President such room to conduct foreign policy, and to make decisions—decisions respecting Cuba.

These are great issues. The Senator from New York has contributed effectively to the discussion of the problem of Cuba. I know that such will be his course in the days to come.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. There is no one in this Chamber, on either side of the aisle, who has more universal respect for his views and his innate good intentions than the Senator from Kentucky.

I am sure that his views and mine as to the necessity for responsible discussion are the same. Whether we would reach exactly the same conclusion as to the method of dealing with the situation is neither here nor there, nor is that question before us today.

I read the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky with great interest. I know he has made a distinct contribution to this discussion and that he is capable of making more contributions in the future, particular-

ly in the field of foreign relations. He has had a wealth of experience not only as a Senator but also as a distinguished ambassador.

No commendatory words would mean more to the junior Senator from New York than those just uttered by my friend from Kentucky.

ROBERT LEROY COCHRAN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, death this past weekend claimed one of Nebraska's most distinguished citizens, the Honorable Roy Cochran.

Governor Cochran was the first chief executive in Nebraska's history to serve three consecutive terms. He came to the Governor's office after an outstanding career as its chief highway engineer.

Upon his retirement as Governor, he continued his public service, first as an Army colonel and commander of Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., then as a consultant on highway matters to the Federal Bureau of the Budget, a position which recognized his eminence in his field. And even during his term here in Washington, he was called to still further service when the late Dwight Griswold, one of our former colleagues, prevailed upon him to take a leave of absence to assist the Greek Aid Mission, which Governor Griswold headed.

It would have been reasonable to expect that upon retirement from these Federal positions, Governor Cochran would have considered his obligation to public service more than fulfilled.

But that was not the case. Governor Cochran responded to a call to return to his old position as Nebraska highway engineer when a particularly difficult situation arose there about 3 years ago.

Those of us who were privileged to know and work with Governor Cochran were not surprised at this evidence of the deep feeling he held toward serving the people of his State, in whatever way he could. There is no previous record of a former Governor returning to work in a subordinate position in State government.

But this was characteristic of Governor Cochran. So long as he was able, he was willing to serve. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article from the February 23, 1963, issue of the Omaha World-Herald, together with an editorial from the Lincoln Journal of the same date, entitled, "Nebraska's Loss," describing the distinguished career of one of Nebraska's finest public servants.

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

COCHRAN DIES; WAS GOVERNOR—HAD 45 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Robert LeRoy Cochran who went from a sodhouse on Nebraska's plains to the Governor's mansion in Lincoln, died at 5 a.m. Saturday in a Lincoln hospital.

He was 77, having observed his last birthday on January 28.

Mr. Cochran, who became Nebraska's 24th Governor in 1935, also for many years was Mr. Highway of Nebraska. He was Nebraska State engineer for 12 years, starting in 1923. In 1959 he returned to the position.

SUFFERED STROKE

In all, he logged 45 years of public service.

Mr. Cochran, in a hospital since last December 20 when he suffered a severe stroke, had been active until last October, when he suffered a slight stroke.

Born in Cass County, Roy Cochran, after his mother's death, traveled across the State by covered wagon with his father and grew up on a Lincoln County farm between Brady and North Platte.

He got his early schooling in a small sod shanty near his home. Graduating from Brady High School, he sold his pony for $70, walked 20 miles to a railroad depot and boarded a train for Lincoln and the University of Nebraska.

SERVED OVERSEAS

Working his way through school, he was graduated with a bachelor's degree in civil engineering in 1910.

After two terms as Lincoln County surveyor, he was appointed a State bridge inspector and 2 years later was promoted to deputy State engineer.

After time out for World War I service overseas, Mr. Cochran returned, was married, and in 1923 was appointed State engineer by Gov. Charles W. Bryan.

In 1934, after considerable urging Mr. Cochran entered the gubernatorial arena. Running as a Democrat, he won the nomination over a field of nine candidates.

He was elected Governor by about 22,000 votes over Dwight Griswold. He was to defeat Mr. Griswold once more and then serve a third term after defeating Charles J. Warner and Charles W. Bryan, who was running by petition.

He sought election to the U.S. Senate in 1940 but lost to Hugh Butler.

After leaving the Governor's mansion, Mr. Cochran returned to Army service as a colonel and for a time was commanding officer at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

In October 1945, he was summoned to serve the Federal Government. He held various jobs for 10 years with the Bureau of the Budget, except for a 7-month stint when he responded to a request by old friend Dwight Griswold to be Deputy Greek Aid Administrator.

HIGHWAY WORK

Mr. Cochran was twice chairman of the Conference of State Governors and was former president of the Council of State Governments.

He was the father of Nebraska's modern highway system.

And he was largely responsible for getting Nebraska out of the mud. In 1923, when he became State engineer, there were fewer than 100 miles of surfaced roads in Nebraska, including gravel.

When he left office as Governor in 1941, Nebraska had 3,500 miles of concrete and oil-topped roads and nearly 5,000 miles of gravel.

GREAT GOVERNOR

Later, as State engineer at 73, he was to help direct interstate highway work.

Saturday Governor Morrison said: "The State has lost one of its great Governors and outstanding public servants, a distinguished Nebraskan who contributed much to his State and country."

Mr. Cochran was a member of St. Matthew's Episcopal Church in Lincoln and the Masonic Lodge.

Survivors include his wife, Aileen, a son, Robert L., Jr., Lincoln; a daughter, Mrs. Lee Grimes, Oxnard, Calif., and seven grandchildren. Services will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday at St. Matthew's Church in Lincoln.

NEBRASKA'S LOSS

As it must to all men, death has come to former Gov. Roy Cochran. Nebraskans in all corners of the State will feel a touch of sadness. Mr. Cochran, though he held many important jobs in the National Government, was a Nebraskan, first, last, and always.

He was a symbol of rugged individualism. He had known the hardship of the earlier days. He was a builder and a believer in the future of Nebraska and Nebraskans. He served 12 years as State engineer and 6 years as Governor.

When he retired from Federal service, he came back to Nebraska to make his home.

At a time when he could have sat back and enjoyed the fruits of his long and successful life, he consented to return to State government as State engineer in the Brooks administration. When he found himself out of tune with that administration he resigned with dignity.

Few men were more widely known and affectionately regarded than Mr. Cochran. He was a man of deep convictions, sometimes out of tune with the latter-day policies of his Democratic Party.

Most of all he was a man of the people, a man who respected the dignity of all men.

RECOGNITION OF WAR CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the sponsorship of S. 869, which has been introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. This measure authorizes the burial of war correspondents in national cemeteries.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor on the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Nebraska will be added as a cosponsor on the next printing of S. 869.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this seems to me to be an appropriate, if somewhat inadequate, recognition of the brave men and women who exposed themselves to the same dangers, hardships, and sacrifices as our fighting men, in order that they could send their eyewitness accounts of the war to our newspapers, magazines, and radio.

When we hear the term "war correspondent" we may be inclined to think of a dashing fellow in a trenchcoat and what the Air Corps called a 50-mission cap, dashing off cables on the big picture of the war. There were, indeed, such men.

But by far the greater number were in the mold of the late Ernie Pyle, dressed in a wrinkled and muddy wool uniform, sharing a foxhole with a scared and lonely infantryman from a little town most of us never heard of.

The war correspondent's life was never so glamorous as the movies would have us believe. This was especially true in the island-hopping campaign in the Pacific where mere survival was a task and getting one's copy filed next to impossible.

In approving S. 869, the Congress will be recognizing the war correspondent for what he was—a soldier, a sailor, an airman—who contributed a great deal to the writing of history and keeping the public informed.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON THE AMERICAN FARM FAMILY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the value of a legislator's mail is often talked

about. In spite of its heavy volume and the sometimes tedious nature of assembly line or generated mail, it serves as an indispensable link between the legislator and the people he represents.

Every once in a while there comes to our desk a message which is especially clear and effective—striking at the very core of a situation and expressing the innermost concern of the author.

The other day such a letter came to me, registering in simple but heartfelt words the distress of a farm wife who is part of a team on a midwestern farm, courageously battling with hard work and constant optimism, but with disappointing progress. This is the life of a Nebraska farm family.

The letter treats of a theme which has become tragically familiar; namely, the financial beating being taken by today's farmers. For the past 10 years farm commodities have brought about the same price, but the things the farmer must buy have gone up so terrifically. For example, to quote from this letter:

When beginning to farm (1951) our tractor cost $1,500; now the same size tractor costs $4,500.

And a little later on:

Maybe the surplus farm products would be used up if groceries would be down in line with what farmers get for their products * * * what seems so unfair is this for example—we get 20 to 30 cents a dozen for eggs and in grocery stores they charge 40 to 50 cents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be set out at this point in the RECORD the entire text of this letter from Mrs. Edwin Krepel, of Howells, Nebr.

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

HOWELLS, NEBR.,
February 12, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: First let me introduce myself, Mrs. Edwin Krepel, from Howells, Nebr. We had the privilege of seeing you in Howells on its 75th jubilee celebration last June. This letter will be far from a formal one for which I apologize but this letter is more a person-to-person chat.

My husband and I live on a 235-acre farm which we rent. Let me begin this way—farmers are taking a terrific financial beating. Ever since we started farming (1951) farm commodities are quite the same price—corn $1 to $1.30—hogs $15 to $20 (and $20 is gotten very seldom); cattle never got over $30 and that price was obtained by few, very few farmers, for only a short time did that price hold. But take things farmers buy—for instance tractors. When beginning to farm our tractor cost $1,500—now the same size tractor costs $4,500. This goes all the way down the line of machinery. Maybe the surplus farm products would be used up if groceries would be down in line with what farmers get for their products. If meat, eggs, etc., would be priced lower then city people could afford to buy more. I believe in this theory very much. What seems so unfair is this—for example—we get 20 to 30 cents a dozen for eggs—and in grocery stores they charge 40 to 50 cents. This spread on farm to grocery price goes on down the line of products farmers sell. What would help farmers is to have the price of machinery down. Then more farmers could buy more.

I don't think it's right for professional men—lawyers, doctors, etc.—to buy cattle and farms for investments. They make more money than the farmers and don't give the farmers a chance. The farmers don't pry in their businesses—why should they? If they buy farms, they should be taxed double. Maybe this letter won't be given any consideration, but we're urged to write our Representatives and Senators. Please try your hardest to help the farmer out of this plight by getting some legislation started to help us—maybe by suggesting some of the things I did.

Thank you for taking time out of your busy life to read my letter.

Sincerely.

MRS. EDWIN KREPEL.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, such a letter is difficult to answer. What indeed is the answer to her appeal—

Please try your hardest to help the farmer out of this plight by getting some legislation started to help us.

There are two developments since the first of the year which are deserving of comment.

PRESIDENT ABANDONS COMPULSORY FEED GRAIN CONTROLS

A year ago at this time, the Congress and all of the farm world were in something of an uproar about the compulsory feed grains program proposed by Secretary Freeman. It was defeated. The Congress rejected it. That was good.

In the President's farm message delivered to Congress on January 31 of this year, it was gratifying to note the abandonment of that objectionable and unworkable compulsory feed grains program approach. In its place, the President calls for legislation authorizing a voluntary program, flexible enough to meet varying conditions and needs, and based upon the same basic principles which have proven successful in the past 2 years.

This change in concept is a distinct gain in the farm legislative picture. It makes much more sense. If care is taken in drafting the farm bill, we will have much more workable and acceptable legislation.

INFLATION CAUSES ARE CONTINUED

It can be seen from Mrs. Krepel's letter that the very basis of the complaint is one-sided inflation applying to things the farmer must buy. The tractor which cost $1,500 in 1951 and now costs $4,500 shows how disastrously the purchasing power of the dollar has shrunk.

The largest single cause of inflation is heavy Government spending and continued deficits.

The budget proposed for next fiscal year calls for $99 billion in spending. This is $18 billion more than the amount recommended for spending by President Eisenhower in his last budget message only 2 years ago. This $18 billion difference represents an increase of over 20 percent.

The deliberately planned deficit—the shortage betwen spending and Government revenues—is $12 billion. The President has indicated that there will not be a balanced budget sooner than about 1967. There are many competent economists who believe it will not be balanced for another 10 years under the course of financing which the President outlined in his budget message. If the President's spending-taxing plan is adopted, the Nation will face a decade of deficits.

This is very disheartening, indeed. It means the further encroachment and advance of the inflation about which Mrs. Krepel and her many millions of fellow farm wives complain.

This is a frightful fate to visit upon the Nation's farmers, as well as the rest of America. Consider the testimony of the President's Budget Director, Mr. Gordon, who testified recently that a balanced budget would actually be harmful to the Nation. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], a Democrat and chairman of the Finance Committee, has called for the immediate discharge of Mr. Gordon as being one who has fiscal ideas dangerous and unsuitable for the post which he holds.

Mr. President, Nebraskans generally will be found in accord with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. They will be found in accord with the idea that the proper approach is an effort to really reduce Government spending and to make every effort to approximate a balanced budget as soon as possible.

But the administration turns a deaf ear to those who cry for fiscal responsibility. It persists in doing the very things which will defeat continued ravages of that ruinous inflation about which Mrs. Krepel complains.

Mr. President, only a year ago, almost to the day, I stood in this Chamber and attempted to point the way in which our farm policies must be directed. I remain convinced that we shall never really come to grips with the problem until we accept some basic truths about American agriculture:

The first truth is that there is great competition within the industry we call farming. Only highly restrictive and repressive measures that farmers themselves will not accept will dull the edge of this competitive sword. That is to say that, in the ultimate, any attempts to control total farm output is foredoomed to failure.

Second, modern science and technology has committed us to an irrevocable course of abundant production. Progress lies in the direction of that abundance being used effectively, not in its atrophy.

Third, the laws of economics are as immutable as the law of gravity and Ohm's law. We cannot repeal laws of economics any more than we can the physical laws. They were not passed by man. They are the result of human behavior in a free society. And the only way they can be amended is by enslavement.

A recognition of these truths would force us to aim our farm planning toward less control, not more. Managed abundance is a favorite slogan with a slogan-happy administration. Compulsory programs can create only mismanaged scarcity and the destruction, perhaps forever, of real opportunities for progress in agriculture.

We are only a step away from making of agriculture a public utility with a Washington bureaucracy issuing licenses and franchises. If we adopt that we may as well prepare to create a new

alphabetical regulatory agency. We will rename the Department of Agriculture the "Rural Office of Planned Economics"; its initials provide the "ROPE" with which the farmer is invited to hang himself.

Fortunately, there are alternatives. One is to set for ourselves the same goals proposed by the President in his message to us, but to start in precisely the opposite direction; that is, toward fewer, not more, Government controls. Let us decide on a transition with order and equity.

We should begin by taking the farmer from the precipice where the Kennedy-Freeman schemes put him with an order of jump, or else, and lead him gradually to the safety of the free and open market.

We should develop a long-range program which each year sees the Government withdrawing more and more, as farmers adjust to the changing situation. During the transition period, the farmer must be assisted financially, and, even more important, he must be supported with sensible programs of research which finds new uses for his products, new markets, and new approaches to reducing his cost of doing business.

The direction toward a solution to our difficulty has already been pointed out. Its ingredients include an effective land retirement program which profits from mistakes of the past and avoids them in the future; elimination of the vicious competition between the farmer and the Government with its hoards of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; an orderly cutoff of wheat allotments and marketing quotas; a relationship between the support price for wheat and that for corn; limitation of agricultural conservation payments; export payments in kind; support of the parity concept.

Mrs. Krepel's plea—expressed by farm wives and their husbands the Nation over—for "getting some legislation started to help us" cannot be answered wholly by any farm bill, however good it may be. It would be of very little use to increase the farmer's income if concurrent steps were not taken to assure that his costs will not soar to even greater heights.

There should also be restored financial commonsense, fiscal responsibility. That will mean a stable dollar. It will mean greater progress the country over.

I am indebted to Mrs. Krepel for writing so sincerely to remind us of these fundamental truths.

U.S. WHEAT HELPS TO BUILD SCHOOL IN PAKISTAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to invite the Senate's attention to an important event which has demonstrated the effectiveness and future potential of the U.S. food for peace program. Surplus wheat supplied the village of Gangu Bahadur in Pakistan by the United States assisted the villagers in the construction of a school building where formerly classes were held in an open courtyard. Villagers donated the funds for the building material, the Pakistani Government made a grant, and 976 bushels of U.S. wheat were given to the village council for labor costs.

The potentialities of this program are enormous. The use of surplus American commodities to assist in the construction of educational facilities in Pakistan and in other countries as well would be of benefit to both ourselves and those countries so aided. The present program in Gangu Bahadur village is a pilot project and is expected to provide information as to the feasibility of expanding donations of food for peace products.

The dedication ceremonies for the school took place at Gangu Bahadur October 29, 1962, while concurrent ceremonies were held in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a press release issued by the Department of Agriculture and the remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on the occasion of the joint ceremonies.

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

DEDICATION CEREMONIES MARK COMPLETION OF SCHOOL U.S. WHEAT HELPED TO BUILD

Ceremonies in Washington and Pakistan today marked completion of a school which U.S. wheat has helped to build for Pakistani children.

While the school was being dedicated in Gangu Bahadur village, Pakistan, there was similar observance of its completion at a U.S. Department of Agriculture ceremony in which Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, His Excellency, Aziz Ahmed, Ambassador of Pakistan, and many others participated.

The building of the school, initiated by Secretary Freeman, has shown how U.S. food-for-peace wheat can help provide educational facilities in developing countries.

The Secretary toured the village of Gangu Bahadur, a village near the historic Khyber Pass. He was so impressed with the village and the strong desire to improve the village that he found in his talk with villagers and village officials, especially Malik Mohammed Shaffi (chairman of the village council) that the Secretary asked the mayor what the village needed most and he was told a school. The Secretary then told the chairman that if American wheat could help build that school he would try to make the wheat available. That conversation a year ago started a chain of events which resulted in the fine new school of today.

The project was turned over to Wheat Associates, Inc., a major cooperator with the Foreign Agricultural Service in foreign market development. Chairman Shaffi, Pakistani cooperator, and Ivan Packard, Pakistan country director of Wheat Associates—U.S.A. Inc., with headquarters in Karachi, Pakistan, gave leadership to the project. The Government of Pakistan and the United States cooperated wholeheartedly.

Approximately 1,000 bushels of U.S. wheat was released from Pakistan Government storage to help pay labor costs. Villagers donated the funds for building material, and their contributions were augumented by a Pakistani Government grant. The school building will accommodate 100 children from six different villages.

Construction and operation of the school is expected to provide information as a pilot project that will prove useful in expanding school construction in Pakistan and possibly other countries.

The Gangu Bahadur School serves six villages in an area about 25 miles from Rawalpindi, the capital of Pakistan and near Taxila, which was an important seat of learning in the second century B.C. Fifteen villages in all comprise the area governed by the Union Council Usman Khattar. The aggregate population is 10,000.

Before the new school building was constructed, classes were held in an open courtyard.

The building covers 1,960 square feet, and includes a kitchen and toilet facilities. Wheat Associates, Inc., will soon institute a school lunch program here in cooperation with the village council.

Total cost of the building was 23,500 rupees ($4,971). The local villagers provided 57 percent of this cost. U.S. wheat, 976 bushels, was given to the village council for labor costs. Total market value of the wheat was $2,114.

Wheat Associates-USA, Inc., is an organization representing U.S. wheatgrowers in Asia, in cooperation with the USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, AT CEREMONIES IN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OCTOBER 29, 1962, HELD IN OBSERVANCE OF THE DEDICATION OF AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL U.S. WHEAT HELPED TO BUILD IN PAKISTAN

This is a happy occasion, Your Excellency, for us and others assembled here today to rejoice in the completion of the school in Gangu Bahadur village.

I offer you and the people of the village my heartiest congratulations on this day of dedication of your new school. How well I recall my visit to your village just a year ago when I met Malik Mohammed Shaffi, and he pointed out to me your need for a school building. This school, which you have built with your own materials and with the help of the people of the United States who have sent U.S. wheat to help pay labor cost, is truly an example of a cooperative effort to fill a community need.

A school is a place of learning. This school has taught us things long before the first student has entered its doors. We see here the results of combining Pakistan's capable manpower, your own voluntary contributions and U.S. agricultural abundance.

Your country places great emphasis on education. One of our early statesmen, Thomas Jefferson, said: "A democracy is based on an enlightened public." Thus we, as well as you, who believe in the dignity of man, have come to realize the essential importance of schools—to enlighten the minds of men.

I sincerely hope that the success of this project will inspire the people of other communities to strive for similar objectives; so that more of the needs of the people of Pakistan can be satisfied through cooperative efforts between our two countries.

May this be only one of many schools built because our two countries who share common goals also are learning to share our common resources to the benefit of the free world.

SOVIET FARMS IN RED—AMERICA PLOWS AHEAD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on an article by Julius Duscha which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, November 25, 1962. The article describes the extraordinary difference between the Soviet and American agricultural systems.

A comparison of the two systems provides a quite remarkable commentary on the effectiveness of the Soviet and American efforts to mobilize agricultural resources. During the past 10 years, surplus farm production has been one of the

principal concerns within our agricultural economy while the Soviets have been plagued by continuing crop failures. Since 1950 average U.S. crop production per acre has increased by 33 percent while that of the Soviet Union has remained constant or even declined. This growing disparity in production has occurred at the same time that the amount of land in the United States devoted to crop production has declined and the absolute number of farmers has also decreased.

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the amount of land being developed for agricultural production has been constantly increasing and the proportion of the population working on the land is 25 percent compared to 8 percent in the United States.

There are a number of reasons for the startling differences between the agricultural economies of the two countries, but certainly an important, if not primary one, is that of individual incentive. The Soviet farmer is regimented by strict bureaucratic controls and suffers from wholly inadequate incentives to produce. His American counterpart has been free to make his own decisions and has substantial incentives to produce.

American success in agricultural productivity compared to Soviet difficulties is a fine tribute to the American agricultural community and sadly underlines the failure of a totalitarian regime to effectively mobilize its agricultural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Post be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SOVIET FARMS ARE IN THE RED WHILE AMERICA PLOWS AHEAD

(By Julius Duscha, staff reporter)

In the Soviet Union another effort was made last week to increase Russia's lagging farm production. In the United States farmers were completing the harvest of another bumper crop.

Nowhere else are the differences between the results of the Soviet and American economic systems so pronounced as they are in agriculture.

While the Soviet Union has had disappointing crops for 4 successive years, farm production in the United States has set records in each of the last 5 years.

American farmers have produced an agricultural economy of unparalleled abundance. But no matter how the Russians organize and reorganize their farm program they cannot seem to meet Soviet food needs.

Why does American farm production keep increasing while Soviet crops lag?

This is a question that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev might have asked himself as he prepared the speech he delivered to the Soviet Communist Party's policymaking Central Committee last week in Moscow.

In his 5½-hour address Khrushchev announced a reorganization of Soviet controls over industry as well as farming. It was the second time within a year that Khrushchev revamped the Soviet farm system.

His latest effort was to order Communist Party officials to set up a hierarchy of industrial and agricultural committees to replace the single party committees that have been concerned with all aspects of the country's economy and life.

Last March Khrushchev reversed the Soviet trend toward decentralization of economic activities and ordered tighter controls over agriculture, particularly over collective farms.

Khrushchev's moves this year were typical of the reaction of Communist officials to the lagging farm production that has plagued the Soviet Union since the Russian Czar was overthrown in 1917.

Soviet agriculture has suffered from bureaucratic controls and meddling as well as from brutal purges, a serious shortage of capital for machinery and fertilizer, wholly inadequate incentives for the farmers themselves and extreme weather conditions.

And why are American farmers the agricultural success story of the world?

There are many reasons, but the principal ones are:

U.S. farmers have been able to make their own decisions, within the limits of Government controls that have imposed restrictions on acreage planted to crops in surplus but not on the ways in which farmers can operate their farms.

The Federal Government has helped farmers by encouraging efficient farming practices through research programs and by rewarding farmers with minimum price supports and other subsidies.

American farmers have had adequate incentives to produce more so that they could buy tractors and other farm machinery, automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, and other household appliances as well as many other consumer goods.

The Government has not controlled the U.S. economy and plenty of capital has been available to develop farm machinery, fertilizers, pesticides and all of the other aids to modern and highly efficient farming.

So spectacular has been the success of American agriculture that for the last 10 years surplus production has been the No. 1 farm problem in the United States while crop failures have been the big story in Soviet agriculture.

Since 1950 crop production per acre in the United States has increased by more than one-third. In the last 5 years alone per acre production has gone up 21 percent.

Corn yields, for example, have mounted in the last 5 years from 48 to 61 bushels to the acre. By contrast, Soviet corn yields are less than 40 percent of the U.S. average.

"Many factors," the Agriculture Department has noted, "contributed to the greater yields, including shifts to higher yielding crops, better seed, more fertilizer, wider use of pest controls and improved tillage practices."

Government controls over acreage of such surplus crops as wheat, corn, and cotton were another factor contributing to an increase in production per acre.

When acreage is cut back farmers inevitably seek to increase yields on their remaining acreage. Also, poorer land is always taken out of production first.

Only 74 percent of all the land in the United States suitable for the production of crops is now being used for crops. And only 8 percent of the total population still lives on farms.

In the Soviet Union new land is still being put into production and farmers make up almost a fourth of the total Russian population.

In the United States output per man-hour on farms has doubled since 1950, as fertilizer and machinery have replaced both land and labor. In the meantime, Soviet farm output has stagnated.

And Americans are eating better than ever, with meat production alone having increased 10 percent since 1950.

The Soviet diet continues to be drab and meat is still in short supply as Khrushchev struggles with Russian agriculture.

However spectacular the American farm success story may be, all is not yet well with U.S. agriculture.

Per capita farm income in the United States increased from $960 in 1955 to $1,430 this year, but is still about 40 percent below the figure for the rest of the population.

Farmers now depend on nonfarm sources for almost a third of their income, and more and more small- and medium-sized farmers are having difficulties keeping up with their highly efficient competitors on larger farms.

Nevertheless, there is no comparison between American and Soviet agriculture or between the productivity of the two systems.

American experts on farming as well as U.S. specialists on Soviet agriculture agree that the Russian farm system can be made to work only if farmers are given adequate incentives and if agriculture is provided with plentiful amounts of capital.

Khrushchev himself must know this, but he continues to place higher priorities on industrial rather than farm production because he obviously believes that an ever-growing industrial plant is far more important.

But even if enough capital were alloted to Soviet agriculture and to the production of consumer goods for Russian farmers to buy it is doubtful that the Soviet system of collective and state farms would work.

American farmers have demonstrated time and again that the agricultural system which works best is the one that leaves basic decisions to the highly individualistic, independent, and hard-working men who are farmers.

But the Soviet Union has never been willing to let farmers run their own farms.

POPULARITY OF FOREIGN AID WITH AMERICAN PUBLIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a recent Gallup Poll released which indicated that, contrary to a widespread mythology, foreign aid is more popular with the American public today than 5 years ago. According to this poll the foreign aid program today has the support of 58 percent of the public as compared to 51 percent 5 years ago. The percentage of those recorded against the foreign aid program has declined from 33 percent in 1958 to 30 percent in 1963.

I would attribute much of this to the interest of the American people in the Alliance for Progress, a program dedicated to the economic, social, and political well-being of our neighbors in the Latin American area.

In general, the statistics cited by this Gallup Poll confirm once again the American public's support of the foreign aid program which has been enthusiastically endorsed by three successive administrations—the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, and the Kennedy administration—and which has consistently won the support of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this release be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SUNDAY'S GALLUP POLL SHOWS PUBLIC SUPPORTS FOREIGN AID IN PRINCIPLE

The Gallup Poll release for February 3 stresses that "foreign aid, in principle, has the endorsement of a substantial majority

(6 out of 10) of the American public." It adds, however, "many persons who support foreign aid in principle voice criticism of certain aspects of the current program."

The latest poll shows greater popular support for aid today than 5 years ago, and it points to majority approval in all regions of the Nation and by Republicans, Democrats and Independents. The exact question follows:

"In general, how do you feel about foreign aid—are you for it or against it?"

	For	Against	No opinion	Total
1958—March	51	33	16	100
1963—February	58	30	12	100
Republicans	54	35	11	100
Democrats	59	28	13	100
Independents	61	28	11	100
East	60	27	13	100
Midwest	58	33	9	100
South	55	29	16	100
Far West	59	32	9	100

CRITICISMS

"One theme running through many of the comments," says the Gallup release, "is that the United States should be a little more discriminating in its dispersal of foreign aid funds—to insure, in effect, that we get our money's worth." The release adds: "Of particular irritation to some Americans are cases where countries receiving such aid have turned against us in international disputes."

AMOUNT OF AID

The release reports widespread misinformation about the amount of money the United States spends annually on foreign aid—with a tendency to inflate the proportion of the budget such aid constitutes. Only 9 percent of the public cited a figure that was close to $4 billion, and only 9 percent know that this is 5 percent or less of the budget. As many as 49 percent think the proportion is greater—ranging up to one-fourth and even half of the Nation's yearly outlay.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, February 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for that great day in our national life when we are again united to commemorate the birth of George Washington, whom we reverently and affectionately call the "Father of his Country."

Our hearts expand with gratitude and pride as we think of his intrepid spirit of adventure, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his fidelity to the principles of righteousness and justice which inspired him to champion the cause of the oppressed colonists.

We rejoice that he bore witness to a lofty idealism when he urged his fellow men to keep alive within their breasts that little spark of celestial fire called "conscience."

Above all we are thankful for his humble and devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer at Valley Forge in order that he might know how to march and keep in step with the eternal will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may strengthen and sustain the soul of our Republic and constrain us to labor in faith and faithfulness for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1(a)(1) of Public Law 87-586, had appointed Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS to be members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC LAW 480 AND COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider on Wednesday, February 27, a special resolution and report from the Committee on Appropriations which will provide supplemental funds for Public Law 480 and Commodity Credit Corporation operations for the balance of the fiscal year 1963.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the date?

Mr. WHITTEN. Wednesday of this week, February 27.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an emergency situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an emergency situation. The Corporation is just about out of funds, and unless these funds are made available they will have to notify the Nation that no more funds for the commodities now supported will be available unless action is taken in the next week or 10 days. What we are doing here is bringing forward from next year's budget request funds to enable them to operate at the present time and not have to stop all price supports. There has been talk about reducing price supports on certain classes of cotton. Then, in regard to corn, they have on hand about 400 million bushels which they could sell, but at the present time, to dump it on the domestic market would have a depressing effect on the market.

In effect it is bringing forward into this fiscal year some of the funds which were requested for the coming fiscal year so as not to have all of this chaos in regard to it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does this bill in any way deal with pending special privilege legislation relating to cotton?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; no, this is directed to the Commodity Credit Corporation in order for it to have funds with which to operate for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a further question: Is not this advance or transfer of funds that would be due for price-support purposes for agricultural products in fiscal year 1964 to be used in this fiscal year 1963 because the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, found it impossible to make good on the very glorified promises he made the American people and the American farmers about a year ago as to how he was going to reduce the cost of farm price supports? Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to say that there are other factors involved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that one of the factors involved?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly the situation is not as good as I had hoped it would be, and as the gentleman from Ohio hopes, but in actuality the Congress last year reduced the budget request by some $800 million, and that is about $300 million more than is being restored here.

There are a good many factors that enter into it. We tried to hold it down. However, unless we give them some relief, we will have chaos throughout the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture certainly did not properly estimate his needs for price-support money last year, and did not inform the Congress properly; is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will have to say this: That the Department and the Bureau of the Budget erred on the side of too much, because they requested $800 million last year and the Congress approved. And, may I say the Congress approved the amount I recommended. We tried to hold it down. But the request was far more than we permitted. This restoration will leave them with $300 million less than the Bureau of the Budget requested last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is still more than the Secretary pledged the American people it would be, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly there are many places where I do not think it has worked out as many people hoped. As the gentleman from Ohio recalls, I did not vote for the farm bill because I did not see soundness of paying cash, when we had surplus commodities. I also differed in other respects.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that millions of farmers have a contract with Uncle Sam which Uncle Sam must honor. The only way Uncle Sam can keep his word and make that contract good in this instance is for Uncle Sam to pay the bill which he promised to pay; is not that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, we have to honor the contracts. May I say in this situation as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, on the one hand the law says they have mandatory obligations. They have to support prices as fixed by law. Then they have another statute which says if they do support them and they do not have the money, then they violate that law.

Mr. JENSEN. I am receiving letters from many farmers saying that Uncle Sam has not delivered the checks to them that were promised under contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. We will have to carry out those contracts.

Mr. JENSEN. It is an obligation, and if Uncle Sam makes a contract with 1 American or 1 million Americans, it is our duty as Representatives in the Congress to see that Uncle Sam does keep his word.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Under the conservation reserve the Government entered into a contract, and it is an obligation that must be honored.

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

There was no objection.

OAS AWAITS U.S. LEADERSHIP BEFORE ACTING ON CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday on a national television network the Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, Dr. Gonzalo Facio, reiterated his plea for U.S. leadership before the OAS can act on the Cuban problem. The OAS leader said that the OAS can only play a role secondary to the United States in relations with Cuba.

In addition to these encouraging statements, the OAS President stated that growing dissatisfaction with the Cuban military and civilian establishment makes anti-Castro moves particularly timely. He recommended internal action as an adjunct to concerted action by the nations of this hemisphere.

As a further indication of OAS receptiveness for U.S. initiative, Dr. Facio stated that in his judgment the hemispheric organization would even go as far as supporting a total U.S. blockade of Castro's island, thus placing Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than 3 years of Castroism in Cuba, we have seen this island reinforced almost daily under our very noses. There have been heightening cries for action from the Congress and other areas of prominence such as the press throughout the Nation. However, this is the second time this year that the president of the international organization has called for solid U.S. initiative.

I reiterate my call that the United States close its seaports to ships calling in Cuba as a first act of U.S. leadership. After so doing, this Government should then turn to the OAS quickly, proposing that the hemispheric body adopt the following U.S. recommendations:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships calling in Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Third. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

Fourth. Impose a travel curb on movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Latin America awaits U.S. initiative while we engage in a debate of semantics as to whether or not Russian military strength in Cuba is offensive or defensive. One Soviet soldier in Cuba is one too many. Whenever the question comes up of whether Soviet missiles, rockets, jet fighter planes, tanks, rifles, and troops in Cuba are offensive or defensive, we would do well to recall the incident of last week when the Cuban Mig's fired on the unarmed U.S. shrimp boat *Ala*. The sting of that incident is still with us.

Should such an attack happen again, "Remember the *Ala*" should be the signal for blistering U.S. retaliation.

CHICAGO, FISK UNIVERSITY AND LEONTYNE PRICE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a great city, a great university and a great singer. It is a story in Americania that projects the true image of our beloved country. It was related, 92 years after its inception, by Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago.

The occasion was Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in the vast auditorium in McCormick Place before the largest and perhaps the most wildly and enthusiastically applauding audience in Chicago's musical history. Leontyne Price had come to sing at a benefit to raise money for Fisk University. The response was recordbreaking. It followed the pattern in the many foreign countries and in the American cities where a public admiration and adoration of Leontyne Price reflected the universal sentiment of millions. The needed money raised for Fisk University also was recordbreaking as the proceeds from a single concert.

But this was the climax of a story that started 92 years ago, a story told by Mayor Richard J. Daley as he spoke briefly at the concert, welcoming Leontyne Price. In 1871, the year of the great fire in Chicago, the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. Every cent of their fee, $50, they sent to the then Mayor Joseph Medill to help out the homeless, suffering people of the metropolis that fire had all but wiped out.

And when Leontyne Price came to the city that had been rebuilt from the ashes, came to raise money for Fisk University, that in the intervening years like Chicago had been growing and expanding and servicing mankind, Mayor Daley paid back the $50 gift of the Fisk Jubilee Singers of 1871, with interest. This is Americania.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following review of Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in Chicago by Claudia Cassidy in the Chicago Tribune:

LEONTYNE PRICE'S FISK BENEFIT LURES $41,000 GROSS AND A DIVIDEND FROM MAYOR DALEY

(By Claudia Cassidy)

Leontyne Price came back with honey in the mouth and fire in the heart, an enticing combination. She enticed a capacity audience and a gross of $41,000 to the Fisk University benefit in the big house in McCormick Place yesterday afternoon, when there also was a visit, a brief speech, and a dividend from Mayor Daley.

The mayor said that back in 1871 the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. It was in Chillicothe, Ohio, and their total, inclusive fee was $50. Then they heard of the Chicago fire and they sent every penny of it to Mayor Josep Medill, to help out. Mayor Daley returned the gift, with interest, but he did not say how much, and neither did Edward W. Beasley, who thanked him for the check. On inquiry, it turned out to be $500.

No one had quite known in advance what even a singer of Miss Price's potency would make of a song recital in a theater seating 5,000. At least where I sat on the fifth row it worked out surprisingly well. The gray steel curtain had been lowered, the piano pushed out front, and a kind of "Aida" or "Cleopatra" effect set up by five tall pillars in muted fireglow, with discreet lighting for shadows. Except for occasional slight huskiness in the low voice—it blurred the Mozart trill—Miss Price was singing superbly, and the quality projected even when she spoke.

If you thought, as some did, that you never had heard her to better advantage, it was partly because in opera she so often sings dramatic soprano roles, while in recital she could cling to her true realm of the lyric or lirico spinto. It was also an advance in musicianship, in presence, in ease before a large audience, but primarily it was voice. This is one of the loveliest voices in the world, in its luster, its purity, its soaring excitement, its sudden depth of feeling, and the way it can wrap opera right around its little finger.

That last happened when she invaded Renata Tebaldi's domain for the two caressing arias from Cilea's "Adriana Lecouvreur"—for even poison caresses Adriana before it kills her. Here for just a second Miss Price

turned into the tiger cat coaxed out when Hervert von Karajan conducts. Her Donna Anna was more stately than when she does the role with him, but no less beautiful.

Her program was rather a brave one for a benefit performance, Schubert, with "An die Leier," "Liebesbotschaft" and "Die Allmacht" outstanding; an interesting group of Poulenc songs programed before his death and sung in his memory and to do him honor; four Samuel Barber songs set to poems by James Joyce, "Nuvoletta" in particular done with a special and capricious skill.

At the back of the house for the spirituals, acoustics backfired. What had been David Garvey's dull piano sounded fresher, but you would not have recognized Miss Price.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pleasure and of pride to all the Members of this body when one of our colleagues, regardless of the side of the aisle he occupies, is accorded editorial commendation all must regard as richly deserved.

ROMAN PUCINSKI was an Air Force pilot. He led his bomber group in the first B–29 bombing raid over Tokyo. In all he flew 48 combat missions over Japan. Now as a distinguished Member of the Congress he was called upon that wartime experience to render a service that well may result in the giving of greater safety to travel by air and the minimizing of the number of plane crashes.

I include in my remarks the editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 23, 1963, that tells the story and pays to the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, a tribute in which I am sure the Members of the House will join.

PUCINSKI COMMENDED

Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, is to be highly commended for winning his long fight to establish crashproof tape recorders in commercial airliner cockpits. The installation of such devices should go a long way toward clearing up the mystery of the last few moments in any future air tragedy.

PUCINSKI is a former Air Force pilot who led his bomber group in the first B–29 bombing raid over Tokyo. He flew 48 combat missions over Japan and holds the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with clusters. PUCINSKI has been fighting to install such tape recorders in airline cockpits since 1959. He maintains, and his judgment as a flyer is sound, that in the last few moments preceding an air tragedy the cockpit crew is far too busy trying to save their aircraft and passengers to make formal reports to a ground station. A crashproof tape recorder, operating automatically during flight will preserve a record of everything said in the cockpit for the investigators.

Australia has already made such an instrument mandatory for their airliners. The United States should follow swiftly and it is to be hoped that no airlines resistance is encountered. This measure is for the best interests of the traveling public.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN MICHIGAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan. This is a companion bill to the one recently introduced in the Senate by Senators MCNAMARA and HART.

We in Michigan pride ourselves on being known as the "Water Wonderland." Outstanding among our natural assets are the water resources available for recreation along our shorelines.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area, because of its many unique features, has been designated as an area worthy of national preservation. Here there are sand dunes, scenic islands, unexcelled stretches of Lake Michigan shoreline, examples of natural history reaching back across the ice ages, and scenic vistas across inland lakes unequaled in beauty anywhere in the Great Lakes region.

It is the objective of this legislation to preserve and develop this natural beauty while at the same time providing for continued private ownership of the existing homes and cottages within the suggested boundaries.

The bill proposes that Congress, building on the experience already gained in the establishment of national seashore areas on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, provide a law under which both the public and private interests will be adequately protected in the preservation and development of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area.

I am confident that, with the growing support evident in Michigan and throughout the Nation for the prevention of this segment of our fourth shoreline, sound and reasonable legislation can be enacted by this Congress. I will work toward this end with my colleagues in the House and with the Senators who have spent so much time in recent months giving leadership to the effort to find solutions to the many complex problems which always arise when we consider the establishment of new national park areas.

We, in Michigan, have another very real interest in bringing this Federal investment to the northwest corner of our State. There is an increasing tendency for tourists and summer vacationers to seek out the most scenic and remote spots for their trips. The system of interstate highways today brings these parts of our country, and even of Canada, within a few hours drive of most Midwestern cities.

The economic importance to Michigan's tourist industry of this national development at Sleeping Bear has been estimated as equalling that gain from the establishment of 10 average-size Michigan industries within the area. A thriving tourist industry is of the greatest importance to the total economy of Michigan.

We seek, then, the dual objective of preserving a unique corner of America for ours and future generations, and obtaining for Michigan this Federal investment in park and recreation land so sorely needed in our populous area of the Nation.

RECIPROCAL TARIFF TREATMENT OF BREAD IMPORTS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposal to provide reciprocal tariff treatment of bread imports. It applies specifically to pan loaf bread or pan-type loaf bread made with the use of yeast, whether sliced or not, and imposes a duty of 7½ percent on these imports.

For many years, bakers in the Buffalo area have suffered because of bread imports from Canada. I understand other areas along the Canadian border have been faced with this problem also.

This imported bread has sold at lower prices than bread produced in Buffalo. While our country grants duty-free treatment to bread imported from Canada, Canada maintains a duty on U.S. bread amounting to 7½ percent last year. I do not think this is fair and if Canada continues the tariff on this product, then certainly we should not hesitate to place the same tariff rate on their bread.

My bill would also provide that the 7½-percent duty would not apply during any period that Canada may extend duty-free treatment for U.S. bread.

SUPERVISORS AS EMPLOYEES UNDER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. DULSKI. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am again reintroducing a measure which will permit supervisors in private industry to be considered as employees under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. My bill would strike out the definition of "supervisor" which is depriving the foremen in American industry of all the benefits provided by this law to other employees.

Today we have strong representation for management at the top. We have strong representation for the rank and file worker at the bottom. In the middle, we find a group of foremen who have no representation at all.

There is no reason why the foremen of America should be denied the right of collective bargaining. They deserve

equal status with all the rights and privileges accorded to the rank and file worker. Correction of this injustice is long overdue, and I urge speedy enactment of this legislation.

TAX REFORMS CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. POFF. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to those proposed tax reforms in the President's message which I fear will have an adverse impact upon charitable contributions to educational institutions. Essentially, they are three in number.

First. The President proposes a so-called 5-percent floor under itemized deductions, that is, itemized deductions will be authorized only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This 5-percent floor will have the effect of reducing the amount deductible on the average of 20 to 30 percent. In other words, in the average case, more than one-fifth of the taxpayer's charitable contributions will be disallowed as a tax deduction. The overwhelming majority of substantial contributions to educational institutions comes from taxpayers who itemize their deductions. The 5-percent floor will significantly curtail the incentive which the present law offers.

Second. Present law authorizes certain individual taxpayers in high income brackets to take unlimited deductions for charitable contributions. The President proposes to erect a so-called 30-percent ceiling on deductions for contributions made by such taxpayers which he says would increase Government revenue by some $10 million. That revenue figure illustrates the magnitude of the total charitable contributions which might be lost to colleges and other institutions if the ceiling is imposed.

Third. Present law authorizes taxpayers to take an additional 10-percent deduction over and above the basic 20-percent limitation if the charitable contribution is made to an educational institution, a church or a medical facility—as distinguished from other types eligible charitable organizations. The President recommends that this preference be discontinued and that all types of charitable organizations stand on the same 30-percent footing. Congress authorized this bonus deduction and granted this preference for a specific, legitimate, legislative purpose; namely, to encourage citizen support of institutions regarded as most essential to the Nation's growth and welfare. If the President's proposal is adopted, it will have the effect of diverting donations heretofore received by educational institutions into other charitable channels such as, in the President's own words, "symphony orchestras and the work of community chests and cultural centers."

One final point needs to be made. To the same extent that these three tax reform proposals will curtail citizen support of our educational system, they will intensify our educational system's dependence upon governmental appropriations. Philosophically, some may view this as a desirable objective. I do not. On the contrary, I view the converse as the best goal. Tax deductions, and/or tax credits, for educational purposes should be increased, rather than decreased, in order that the people might be encouraged to finance their own educational system and thereby retain control over its curriculums, its standards and its performance.

MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. HARSHA. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with continued deep concern for the welfare and security of our Nation, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. The resolution calls upon the United States, bilaterally or unilaterally, to take whatever steps are necessary to rid the hemisphere of the Castro Communist threat.

The proof is in the pudding. Surely, after the shrimp boat incident, even the eggheads in the State Department should be convinced that whether a weapon is offensive or defensive is determined solely by the state of mind or intent of the individual controlling the weapon.

The evidence is conclusive that Cuba is a Communist outpost from which dedicated efforts are being effected to subvert the Western Hemisphere.

At a recent meeting of the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev stated:

> Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist, Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba.

The United States is spending hundreds of millions of dollars and risking American lives daily in an effort to halt communism in Vietnam, yet our effort to combat that same menace within throwing distance of our own shores is very feeble.

The recent OAS Security Committee report indicates that Russia, through its bastion of operation in Cuba, has given orders for unremitting subversive pressure against Latin America. The presence of approximately 14 training camps for saboteurs, subversive and infiltration agents is confirmed in the report.

This all constitutes a very grave threat to the security of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere. My resolution clearly restates the Monroe Doctrine as being the policy of the United States and any attempts on the part of a Communist country to extend its system to any portion of this hemisphere is dangerous to our peace and safety. The resolution urges the President to take jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, economic or military action as may be necessary to fully implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere.

The American people are fed up with the futile policy of spending billions of dollars in foreign aid, ostensibly to defeat and combat communism throughout the world and, at the same time, assuring the Communists of a base of operations in Cuba from which to enhance their activities.

If the defeat of communism is a valid reason for spending billions in foreign aid, then certainly that same reason is ample justification for implementing the Monroe Doctrine, to say nothing of the protection of our own freedom.

MR. TRUMAN ON THE CUBAN SITUATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have now heard from the oracle of Independence, Mo., on the subject of Cuba.

In a syndicated newspaper article published yesterday, Harry S. Truman essayed the double role of history teacher and prophet of hope.

On both counts he was a dismal flop.

He would have rendered a far greater service by silence.

In this article, believe it or not, Mr. Truman undertook, among other things, a dissertation on the Platt amendment.

One provision of this Platt amendment, incorporated in the Cuban Constitution on our insistence after we liberated Cuba from Spain, asserted:

> The Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence [and] the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty.

Having called attention to this provision, Historian Harry offered this comment in yesterday's article:

> It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development. These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

But Mr. Truman overlooked, or chose not to mention, one other historical fact. The Platt amendment was not there in 1959, when Castro took over in Cuba. It had not been there for a quarter of a century.

The Platt amendment was abrogated by the United States in May 1934, at the specific behest of Democratic President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And one of the direct effects of this action was a downgrading, in both national and hemispheric respect, of any unilateral dedication of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine.

I happen to believe that the Eisenhower administration is open to criticism in its handling of the Cuban situation and the Castro takeover. I have been saying so publicly since October 1959. I deplore its overhasty recognition of Castro, its disregard of clear evidence of his Communist ties, and its tardy declaration that the United States would not permit establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet this declaration was made by President Eisenhower in July 1960. And I do not now propose to accept Mr. Truman's Monday morning quarterbacking invocation of the Platt amendment as the basis for action we ought to have taken—the selfsame Platt amendment which Mr. Truman's immediate predecessor in the Presidency consigned to the ashcan and which fact Mr. Truman conveniently forgot to mention.

I might add that Mr. Truman's evaluation of much more recent history is equally deficient.

He declared:

> The Cuban crisis provided the United States with an opportunity to make clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

Stand firm? By a declared willingness to give a no-invasion pledge? Stand firm? By a complete backdown on our on-site inspection demand? Mr. Kennedy, in his February 7, 1963, press conference, acknowledged that this demand is "now a dead letter."

Stand firm? What has happened to the President's repeated pledge that "Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated?" The record is abundantly clear that this, too, is another "dead letter."

As much a dead letter, Mr. Truman, as the Platt amendment.

And what of Mr. Truman's attempted role, in his syndicated article, as a prophet of hope? His contribution on this score also leaves a great deal to be desired—alike by the American people and the tragic people of Cuba:

> Somehow we must seek a way of helping the Cuban people to liberate themselves once and for all.

Not only are there no specifics offered toward this desired goal but there is an aura of hope deferred, of fantastic resignation, of larger problems which must first be solved—again with not specifics offered. Mr. Truman wrote:

> Cuba has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia.

Unmistakably true—but hardly a solution.

Mr. Truman also said:

> The Cuban people are now pretty much in the same fix as the Hungarians.

This assessment brings to mind President Kennedy's equally glum and negative appraisal of the situation in his February 7, 1963, press conference—a sequel to the October "triumph" of "firmness":

> I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination [of communism in Cuba]. I am quite obviously hopeful that it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. I remember a good deal of talk in the early 1950's about liberation, how Eastern Europe was going to be liberated. Then we had Hungary, Poland, and East Germany and no action was taken. The reason no action was taken was that they felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war.

Mr. Truman did go one step beyond President Kennedy's wait-and-see policy:

> It is my opinion that until the sources of all the world's tensions and dangers are overcome within those nations that constitute the centers of the Communist conspiracy; namely, the police states of Russia and China, there is little chance for the occupied satellites to settle matters for themselves.

How ironical that it was the let-the-dust-settle variety of a wait-and-see policy, in President Truman's own administration, that saw China lost to the free world. On December 1, 1961, President Kennedy told his press conference:

> I always have felt that we did not make a determined enough effort in the case of China.

Belatedly, Mr. Truman has identified the real enemies, even though he seems to persist in the illusion that the internal revolt which will not work in Hungary—or Cuba—will somehow accomplish miracles in Soviet Russia and Red China.

But there is still a strange reluctance to suggest specific policies of firmness and bold action from without.

His statesmanship of victory—the same statesmanship which first hamstrung and then fired MacArthur—consists of the plaintive litany:

> We, of course, continue to hope that someway, somehow.

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BECKER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, because of the use of the term "bipartisan foreign policy" I believe there is a great misconception in the minds of many people, including some Members of Congress. I have asked for a special order for today, and immediately after the regular order of business and the special orders heretofore entered I intend to discuss what I believe to be bipartisan foreign policy, or my idea of it. I want the RECORD to be straight because when I take the floor, as I did a couple of weeks ago, I do not want anyone to say I am violating bipartisan foreign policy or bipartisanship in our foreign policy. If any Members want to participate in this discussion, I shall be glad to yield them time during that special order.

EIGHTY-EIGHT MEMBERS OF HOUSE SIGN JOINT LETTER OPPOSING EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INCREASE IN OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY BY BACK-DOOR METHOD

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter over the signature of 88 Members of the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency is holding committee hearings today and tomorrow on H.R. 3872. This bill would increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and likewise would extend the period within which the Bank may exercise its functions.

Since this legislation would provide $2 billion additional authority to expend from public debt receipts or, as it is generally called, by the back-door spending method, a group of 88 Members of the House are urging that instead, any additional financial provisions found necessary for the Bank be made through the normal traditional appropriations procedure.

For the general information of the Congress, I include at this point the text of a joint letter to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee expressing our opposition to the back-door spending provision and listing the names of the 88 Members of the House whose names are appended to this letter.

FEBRUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in opposition to the financing provisions contained in H.R. 3872 and represents the views of 86 Members of the House of Representatives whose names are appended below. We are hopeful that your committee will give consideration to our views and make this letter a part of the record of the hearings which we understand are being held on February 25 and 26.

We understand that the only significant recommendation from the President in the pending budget for new obligating authority through the so-called back-door procedure is the $2 billion additional authority for the Export-Import Bank to expend from public debt receipts, for which provision would be made in H.R. 3872 now pending in your committee. We strongly recommend that any additional financial provision found necessary for the Bank be made through the traditional congressional appropriations process.

After some years of debate and contention about the dimensions and undesirable characteristics of the various back-door practices, the last session of the 87th Congress produced the most significant results from past efforts to alert the Congress and the country to this diffusive method of legislating the finances of the Government. According to available tabulations, only 2 such bills were enacted, to the amount of about $437 million, in sharp contrast to the year before when the Executive requests in 11 such bills totaled $28,670 million plus; some $19,673 million plus was enacted into law.

Discontinuance of the practice, it seems clear, undeniably enhances the opportunities to legislate for functions of Government in a more responsible and orderly manner within a framework of competitive priorities. Especially is the question important to the maintenance by the House of its prerogatives and supremacy in money matters. As you doubtless know, the other body has indulged heavily in some recent years in the origination of back-door bills.

It is of course true, as in the case of some other going programs no longer funded through back-door methods, that the borrowing and lending authority for the Bank has heretofore been furnished through public debt authorization carried in legislative, rather than the regular appropriation, bills.

But there is recent parallel for the change we now urge. Last year the President was supplied, through the usual legislative authorization (Public Law 87-490) and appropriation method (Public Law 87-872), with $2 billion additional for subscription to the International Monetary Fund; U.S. participation in the Fund had theretofore been furnished by public debt expenditure authority carried in a legislative bill. In fact, as you know, this change in method of funding for the IMF was recommended by the executive branch and the Committee on Banking and Currency. We are not aware of any hindsight dissatisfaction with the change. Nor can we perceive of any valid objections to a similar change for the Export-Import Bank. The Bank's operating budget is already subject to annual review and approval in regular appropriation bills—as are virtually all other Government corporations—and in the last two, limitations on certain expenditures, as was contemplated might be done when the corporation budget law was adopted, have been written into the bills by the Committee on Appropriations and approved by the House without objection or without apparent adverse results to necessary operations of the Bank.

A similar example is the Small Business Administration; additional loan capital is supplied as necessary through the regular appropriation bills.

With the recent significant progress made by the House in the matter, we believe it especially important that the pending bill authorize the necessary appropriation in lieu of a direct public debt expenditure authority and we earnestly hope that your committee will see it that way.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

The following Members of the House have authorized the use of their names as cosigners of this joint letter:

Hon. HOMER E. ABELE, 10th District of Ohio.
Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON, 16th District of Illinois.
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Third District of New Jersey.
Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY, Second District of Kansas.
Hon. WALTER BARING, Congressman at Large, Nevada.
Hon. WILLIAM H. BATES, Sixth District of Massachusetts.
Hon. JAMES F. BATTIN, Second District of Montana.
Hon. FRANK J. BECKER, Fifth District of New York.
Hon. E. Y. BERRY, Second District of South Dakota.
Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS, Eighth District of Ohio.
Hon. BILL BROCK, Third District of Tennessee.
Hon. JAMES E. BROMWELL, Second District of Iowa.
Hon. JAMES T. BROYHILL, Ninth District of North Carolina.
Hon. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, 10th District of Michigan.
Hon. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Third District of Colorado.
Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, 12th District of Florida.
Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Third District of New York.
Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Fourth District of Illinois.
Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE, 12th District of Ohio.
Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, Third District of South Carolina.
Hon. JOHN DOWDY, Seventh District of Texas.
Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, First District of Virginia.
Hon. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Third District of Kansas.
Hon. GERALD FORD, Fifth District of Michigan.
Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY, Third District of Virginia.
Hon. MILTON W. GLENN, Second District of New Jersey.
Hon. H. R. GROSS, Third District of Iowa.
Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER, 10th District of California.
Hon. EDWARD J. GURNEY, 11th District of Florida.
Hon. JAMES A. HALEY, Seventh District of Florida.
Hon. DURWARD G. HALL, Seventh District of Missouri.
Hon. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, Congressman at Large, Wyoming.
Hon. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Sixth District of Ohio.
Hon. RALPH HARVEY, 10th District of Indiana.
Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Sixth District of Iowa.
Hon. WALT HORAN, Fifth District of Washington.
Hon. FRANK J. HORTON, 36th District of New York.
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER, 32d District of California.
Hon. CHARLES R. JONAS, Eighth District of North Carolina.
Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN, 31st District of New York.
Hon. CARLETON J. KING, 30th District of New York.
Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL, 16th District of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JOHN KYL, Fourth District of Iowa.
Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, Seventh District of Wisconsin.
Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, 24th District of California.
Hon. ROBERT MCCLORY, 12th District of Illinois.
Hon. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Second District of Maine.
Hon. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, 19th District of Illinois.
Hon. CLARK MACGREGOR, Third District of Minnesota.
Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Sixth District of Maryland.
Hon. CATHERINE MAY, Fourth District of Washington.
Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, 40th District of New York.
Hon. ANCHER NELSEN, Second District of Minnesota.
Hon. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, First District of North Dakota.
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, 37th District of New York.
Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN, Fifth District of Louisiana.
Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, 39th District of New York.
Hon. ALEXANDER PIRNIE, 32d District of New York.
Hon. RICHARD H. POFF, Sixth District of Virginia.
Hon. ALBERT QUIE, First District of Minnesota.
Hon. CHARLOTTE REID, 15th District of Illinois.
Hon. BEN REIFEL, First District of South Dakota.
Hon. JOHN J. RHODES, First District of Arizona.
Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, 34th District of New York.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON, 33d District of New York.
Hon. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, Sixth District of Indiana.
Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, First District of Wisconsin.
Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, 17th District of Pennsylvania.
Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, First District of Iowa.
Hon. DON L. SHORT, Second District of North Dakota.
Hon. EUGENE SILER, Fifth District of Kentucky.
Hon. M. G. SNYDER, Third District of Kentucky.
Hon. BILL STINSON, Seventh District of Washington.
Hon. ROBERT TAFT, JR., Congressman at Large, Ohio.
Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE, 13th District of California.
Hon. VERNON W. THOMSON, Third District of Wisconsin.
Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Sixth District of Washington.
Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK, Fifth District of Virginia.
Hon. JAMES B. UTT, 35th District of California.
Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, Sixth District of Wisconsin.
Hon. J. ERNEST WHARTON, 28th District of New York.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Seventh District of New Jersey.
Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Third District of Mississippi.
Hon. BOB WILSON, 36th District of California.
Hon. JOHN W. WYDLER, Fourth District of New York.
Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, 11th District of California.
Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK, 17th District of Ohio.
Hon. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., Fourth District of Louisiana.

NUCLEAR HELP FOR COMMUNISTS

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the United Nations Special Fund is planning a project in Communist Yugoslavia that would use American tax dollars to strengthen a nation dedicated to a bloc that says it wants to bury us.

The project has been approved by the Governing Council of the U.N. Special Fund and calls for a Federal center—in Yugoslavia—for nuclear research.

I have studied a publication of the U.N. Special Fund in which I find these statements, and I have pursued development of the project by checking with the U.S. Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Atomic Energy Commission.

This proposed 3-year U.N. project is planned for a total cost of $1,752,400 with

$546,000 of that coming from the Special Fund, and the rest from Yugoslavia. As has been widely noted in the past few days in this House, the Special Fund receives 40 percent of its funds from U.S. contributions.

Even more shocking is the fact that this provision for nuclear assistance to a Communist-bloc nation apparently has been neatly disguised as only an agricultural project.

The project, which will be administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency if final details are agreed to by that Agency, Yugoslavia and the Special Fund, is designed in the words of the Special Fund to:

Assist in extending research and training facilities at the Institute for Application of Nuclear Research in Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Sciences at Zemun, near Belgrade.

However, in the first sentence of its project analysis—which interestingly enough is marked by the United Nations for "Restricted" distribution—the Special Fund calls not only for the application of nuclear research to the field of agriculture, but also for a Federal center for nuclear research and training at the Zemun Institute.

The plans of the Special Fund call for financing which would increase the staff of the nuclear research Institute from 32 resident scientists to 90 by 1965. It also calls for an expansion of buildings, more equipment, 12 research fellowships, and for providing of a "phytotron" to Yugoslavia.

A phytotron is an uncommon instrument for plant research used in connection with radioactive isotopes in creating artificial environments.

My colleagues, even if the American taxpayers were not being asked to pay in large part for a nuclear center in a Communist nation, it is highly unclear to me why they should be asked to subsidize solution of agriculture problems which, if solved, will enable one of our enemies to grow stronger.

The Special Fund itself notes that the Yugoslav plan is to increase from output by 41 percent within just 4 years, mainly in production of grain and livestock.

We have a quite unbelievable farm subsidy program right here at home. If the United States has any extra money left in these deficit days, it would be well for us to apply it to our own agriculture problems—not to give it to the U.N. for use in alleviating Communist problems.

This Yugoslav project would concentrate in its agricultural phases on soil fertility and plant nutrition, plant breeding, and animal husbandry. But the project plan leaves a loophole whereby agriculture may not be the only goal of this research.

I note that the educational program under the project calls for training of about 25 Yugoslav nuclear research specialists at the graduate level. Presumably these graduates, once trained, could work on things other than farm problems.

Here is a breakdown of the moneys programed by the United Nations Special Fund for the Yugoslav project:

Experts, $180,900. Fellowships, $60,000. Equipment, $258,700. Miscellaneous, $10,900. Overhead of the International Atomic Energy Agency, $32,500. Preliminary investigations, $3,000.

The American officials with whom I have checked about this project tell me they presume that the agricultural research under this program would involve the use of radioactive isotopes, but they remain uncertain about just where these isotopes for Yugoslavia will come from.

As this House knows, I am a doctor. As a doctor I am familiar with the many uses for isotopes in medical research. I know also that such tracer isotopes are equally valuable in plant and animal research and in work with fertilizers.

Most of the isotopes used in the United States are produced by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge, Tenn., Laboratories. But I have been told by the AEC that it is highly unlikely that a license could be issued and American isotopes provided to a Communist bloc nation.

However, isotopes are available from any nation that can produce them via nuclear reactors or electron accelerators. The United Kingdom sells some commercially, I understand, and the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia also have reactors.

Yugoslavia also has a small research reactor, but it is not certain whether that reactor can produce the isotopes necessary for this United Nations program.

It must be noted here that isotopes once provided have many other uses than agricultural research. They can be used, for instance, to trace the flow of liquids and gases in pipelines, and to test and measure strengths and dimensions of metals and other materials. Isotopes also can be used in studies of insecticides and other biological and chemical materials including materials for chemical and bacteriological warfare.

In short, these radioactive, nuclear isotopes are not the sort of thing which American taxpayers should be helping to provide or to buy for the use of the Communist bloc.

The Members of this House may be assured that I am continuing my investigation into this vital matter concerning nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia subsidized by the American taxpayer. One would think that even our oneworldly State Department would have learned the lesson of experience long ago—that there no longer is any justification for wooing or trying to purchase the loyalty of another sovereign nation, particularly a Communist nation.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the uses of radioactive isotopes, I am including at this point in my remarks portions of an article from a special report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission listing a number of the uses for these isotopes in industry, medicine and agriculture:

AGRICULTURAL USES OF ISOTOPES

In agriculture, radioisotopes are an important tool that is helping scientists to unlock secrets of the growth of plants and animals and the pests and diseases that injure or destroy them. They are contributing to increasing productivity and better economy. They have been applied in a variety of research on plant nutrition, crop diseases, fertilizer application and effectiveness, soil conditions, animal diseases, milk production, insect eradication, and development of new plant varieties through mutations. Over $5 million per year of agricultural research is performed with radioisotopes.

Agricultural research often requires years to mature because of crop cycles, and additional time which elapses before results can be applied on the farms. Except in a few instances, the agricultural benefits of isotopes lie chiefly in the future.

MEDICAL USES

Following the discovery of radium in 1898, medical researchers soon recognized the possibilities of using radioactivity.

The supremacy of radioactive elements as tracers to define physiological processes is readily apparent in medical and biological fields. The tracers correspond in size and kind to the thing they trace. They are not foreign or chemically different—they are the material or a true part thereof. Some disease processes that have been studied are cancer, leukemia, heart malfunctions, arteriosclerosis, virus infections, multiple sclerosis, arthritis, anemia, gout, and nutritional deficiencies.

In addition to such universal use of tracers for biomedical research, radioisotopes have made possible some advances in medical diagnosis. Dynamic tracer diagnostic tests of the functions of organs in patients have been developed for thyroid, heart, liver, kidney, bone marrow, and spleen. Tracer tests are used routinely for the total volume of plasma, blood or water in the body, for lifetime of blood cells, and for localization of tumors, particularly of the brain. Over 2,000 hospitals or medical groups use isotopes for diagnosis.

In the area of radiation treatment, radioisotopes found early applications in medicine. Many of the therapeutic uses, particularly in cancer treatment, follow the principles established with X-rays and radium. Radioisotopes have greatly extended these treatments. At the end of 1959 over 300 radioisotope teletherapy units were licensed for use in the United States alone. These units may contain as much as several thousand curies of either cobalt 60 or cesium 137.

INDUSTRIAL USES

Most of the widespread applications of radioisotopes that industry has developed use very little radiation and fall into two categories: radioisotopes for tracing, and small radiation source for gaging or testing.

Radiotracing applications now in use include: wear and lubrication tests to find best lubricants and conditions of operation, involving piston rings, gears, and machine parts; wear tests on paints, varnishes, wax coatings, and other protective agents; study of detergents and various cleaning agents on cloth and fabrics; finding leaks inside complicated systems and underground gas storage depots; tracing flow in pipelines, streams, catalytic crackers, chemical processing plants, and fluid or slurry systems.

In the area of radioinspection, industry has expanded radioisotope radiography as an efficient and cost-saving way of meeting the higher quality and greater safety specifications required for many products today—both for civilian and military use. Welds are routinely radiographed with radioisotope cameras on ships, tanks, pipelines, and containment vessels. Such radioeyes also are used to tell whether the fuel in rockets meets the rigid requirements of uniformity so necessary for successful operation. Construction of a single ship often requires the radiographing of as many as 10,000 welds. The savings in rejects and elimination of destructive tests for welds, casts, and other fabricated products, is significant. Even more important is the greatly reduced chance

of failures and accidents. Another important factor is radiation beam inspection of rapidly moving packages, cans, sheet material, metal strip, and fluid products. Isotope gages have been developed to penetrate through or reflect from material to measure levels, content, thickness, or density of a number of kinds of products.

A broad scope of products now is controlled and improved by isotope gages. Since they permit products to be made much more uniform and of higher quality, the user or consumer benefits directly as well as indirectly through the assistance isotopes can give to improved efficiency and productivity to aid segments of the economy.

High intensity radiation is starting to receive its first routine uses, but its full development depends on considerable research. The intense radiation from large quantities of fission products may ultimately find use as a new industrial process reagent and create new products. Some types of grafted plastics, such as selective ion exchange membranes used in desalting sea water, can best be produced by irradiation.

DEVELOPMENT OF RADIATION INSTRUMENTS

Since the human senses cannot detect nuclear radiations except at extremely high levels, the development of systems of detection and measurement of radiation has been essential to development of the practical applications of radioisotopes. The design and manufacture of such instruments was the first branch of the private atomic energy industry established. Many instruments originally were designed and manufactured in the Government's atomic laboratories, but immediately after the war the Commission supported development of commercial manufacture. Significant advances have been made by industry in the development of more stable and sensitive circuits for radioisotope measuring applications. By 1959 some 120 companies were manufacturing a variety of instruments, detectors, special components, and accessories.

Nuclear radiation detectors developed to date may be classified according to several types.

In pulse systems, the output of the detector consists of a series of signals, each of which represents the interaction of a nuclear particle or gamma ray with the detector. The well-known Geiger counter is an example of a pulse detector. Another is the proportional counter which is able to identify different radioisotopes according to their characteristic radiations. Still another example is the scintillation counter which operates on the principle that when ionizing particles pass through certain crystals, liquids, or organic polymers, flashes of light (scintillations) are emitted. An electron multiplier phototube picks up the faint scintillations and amplifies the resulting pulses to be detected and identified by the measuring apparatus.

In nonpulse detection systems, the output is the average of the cumulative effects due to many interactions of radiation with the detector; no attempt is made to resolve the individual events. The current-producing ionization chamber is a good example; the output is proportional to the total ionization current produced within the detector. Another example is the photographic system. When a piece of film is exposed to radiation, the emulsion reacts in the same way as when struck by visible light. The amount of radiation can be estimated from darkening of the film. Colorimetric detection is another example. When radiation reacts with certain chemicals containing chlorine (i.e., trichlorethylene and water, or chloroform and water), hydrochloric acid is formed. This causes a change in color of certain dyes, and the degree of color change produced is dependent upon the amount of radiation received.

Several other detector systems have been used for specialized problems. These include cloud chambers for laboratory studies, nuclear-track photographic emulsion plates, crystal conducting counters, chemical detectors, and colorimetric devices for detection of large doses of radiation. In addition, a number of systems have been designed to detect and measure neutrons. Most of these have used boron, lithium or cadmium, in conjunction with one of the detector types discussed (except colorimetric), to detect the secondary radiation resulting from neutron capture by these materials.

In the field of low-level counting, university work on radiocarbon dating of archeological materials was important in early developments. Noteworthy in this field was the pioneering research on the screen wall counter by W. F. Libby at the Universities of California and Chicago. Libby's technique involved placement of the sample inside a counter that operated on the sensitive and simple Geiger principle.

In more recent years, some investigators have substituted acetylene gas synthesized from radiocarbon samples used in proportional counters for the screen wall counter. Other techniques are based on a variety of liquid scintillators that respond well to soft beta radiation when the sample is mixed with the liquid scintillators.

These developments in low-level counting are pointing a way for applying these techniques to industrial processing. Present-day instrumentation is suitable only for laboratory needs, and designs must be modified to meet the rigid requirements of industrial applications.

THE STRANGE CASE OF PEREZ JIMENEZ

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous interest among some of my constituents about the plight of Perez Jimenez, former President of Venezuela, now in Florida, who is involved in extradition proceedings brought by the U.S. Government.

One of my constituents has sent me an article dealing with this subject from the Wanderer of January 10, 1963, with the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

I have also studied the State Department paper on this subject and, although I may not agree entirely with either treatment of the matter, I think it will serve a useful purpose to place them here side by side.

The article follows:

THE STRANGE CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ

(Condensed from an account in Popular, Miami Spanish-language weekly, December 30, 1962.)

Certain legal cases, due to a strange series of incidents, coincidences and paradoxes, tend to become famous in the annals of jurisprudence. The case of Marcos Perez Jimenez has all the indications of becoming one of these cases. The former President of Venezuela is now languishing in a Dade County jail, held virtually incommunicado, and subjected to the treatment usually accorded highly dangerous convicted felons.

Why?

No person in authority can give, or dares to give, a reasonable answer.

Has the ex-President violated any U.S. law?

No.

Has the ex-President been convicted in Venezuela?

No.

Has the ex-President, holder of the U.S. coveted Legion of Merit, with the rank of commander in chief, broken any conditions imposed upon political exiles in the United States?

Again, no.

Then why is he imprisoned and denied benefit of bond? There are many apparent answers. For one thing, his arch-enemy, President Betancourt of Venezuela, has hired a very influential law firm in Washington in an effort to satiate his vengeance on Perez Jimenez. The law firm is headed by Presidential Adviser Dean Acheson.

Perez Jimenez has been denied the right to post bond. Spies and saboteurs are granted this right in the United States. Why is it denied in this case?

Betancourt of Venezuela wants it that way.

As a former Communist leader, Betancourt can do no wrong. He's even the darling of most of the U.S. press which consistently views Communist dictators as "premiers" or "chairmen," never as bloody autocrats. This name is only reserved for the rightist dictators friendly to the United States. As the Turkish Ambassador recently said in Washington: "Americans love their enemies and despise their friends."

Every believer in the sacred principles of the U.S. Constitution, its Bill of Rights and what used to be a government of laws and not of personalities would do well to study the strange pattern of the Perez Jimenez case.

BACKGROUND

Who: Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez, President of Venezuela, 1952–58, now behind the bars of Dade County jail.

Age: Forty-eight.

Family: The former Venezuelan President lived at 4609 Pine Tree Drive, Miami Beach, Fla., with his wife, the former Flor Chalbauld, and four daughters: Margot, 17; Florangel, 14; Maria Sol, 10; and Flo de Maria, 6.

"It is my hope and desire that the U.S. Government will continue to allow me to live peacefully and quietly here with my family, as I have done the last 3 years, in order that my daughters may continue their American education, and that my wife and I may be a part of this community," said Gen. Perez Jimenez.

Church: The entire family regularly attends St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Miami Beach.

Friendship with the United States: Gen. Perez Jimenez, was one of the United States of America's stanchest supporters in this hemisphere.

In 1954 he was awarded the highest rank of the Legion of Merit by the United States for "his sound foreign-investment policies," and his government was cited by the late Secretary of State Dulles as "an example to other countries in Latin America."

Under his administration, American companies and individuals found Venezuela an ideal business climate for investment and operation. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, those investments were drastically cut back in 1957 after Romulo Betancourt came into power. The country went from a policy of encouragement to one of discouragement where essential foreign investment was concerned.

Anti-Communist record: Not only was communism outlawed under the administration of Perez Jimenez, but members and sympathizers left Venezuela and their activities were practically nonexistent. The general severed relations with Russia and other satellite countries.

During this period the Accion Democratica and Communist parties entered into a coalition to overthrow the anti-Communist Perez Jimenez government.

It is interesting to note that the Communist Party had been officially recognized during the years 1945–48 after Betancourt headed a seven-man ruling junta. With Betancourt's return to head of the government in 1958, communism again became legal in Venezuela and is flourishing there right now. The Encyclopedia Britannica reports that the number of Communists in Venezuela jumped from 20,000 in 1957 to 35,000 in 1959 and to 40,000 in 1960.

Status in the United States: Perez Jimenez entered the United States with a valid visitor's visa. Subsequent events in Venezuela made it impossible for him to return to that country. Consequently, he overstayed his temporary visa. Deportation proceedings were instituted and then deferred pending action on his application for permanent residence in the United States.

Perez Jimenez also applied for stay of deportation in formal proceedings provided by law on the ground that he would be subject to political persecution if deported to Venezuela. All immigration proceedings have been deferred pending outcome of the extradition matter. The Immigration Service had never required that the general be placed under bond, nor were his actions substantially restricted.

Attempts to extradite: General Perez Jimenez and his family came to the United States in 1958; thereafter sought political asylum. The general remained unmolested until August 25 of that year when extradition proceedings were formally instituted by the Betancourt regime. It is ironic that while the country seeks the return of Perez Jimenez, his wife and children are political exiles and are not permitted to return to Venezuela. It is also ironic that during Perez Jimenez' regime his government prepared for the extradition of Romulo Betancourt as a result of an assassination attempt upon the general's life; Perez Jimenez halted the proceedings to avoid involving the United States in his country's internal politics.

The Venezuelan Government has charged Perez Jimenez with complicity in the alleged murder of four persons and alleged misappropriation of funds. Upon completion of extradition proceedings in June 1961, U.S. District Judge George W. Whitehurst found that Perez Jimenez had no connection with the alleged murders but found probable cause as to the alleged financial charges. Evidence in the proceedings has been forwarded to the U.S. State Department. A petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed by counsel for Perez Jimenez which was predicated upon, among other things, a statement by Judge Whitehurst that he had in fact not read the evidence in the financial charges.

Appeal to U.S. court of appeals: The habeas corpus petition was denied on August 23d by U.S. District Judge William A. McRae, Jr. An appeal was made. A $100,000 bond was posted by the general.

The general, in a recent press conference, announced his intent to use every legal remedy at his disposal to remain in the United States.

Military career: Perez Jimenez graduated from military school in Caracas in 1933 as the most prominent student during 3 years of studies. He was given the rank of sublieutenant on July 5, 1933; entered the artillery division. He was then made professor of ballistics, professor of armaments, and professor of military information at the military institute and served at the school as staff officer until 1939. He went to Peru and continued his military studies; received his diploma as an officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has received decorations from Venezuela, Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, and the United States.

Political career: Following the 1945 revolution which deposed President Medina Angarita, Perez Jimenez launched his political career by opposing the seven-man junta headed by Romulo Betancourt. He continued to oppose the Gallegos regime of 1947, and the Leftist Accion Democratica. In 1948; when the Accion Democratica government was forced to retire, he became Defense Minister and a member of the military junta that ruled the country and which later became the Independent Electoral Front. In December of 1952 he became Provisional President of Venezuela; was elected Constitutional President in 1953. He held office until January 1958, when the Government was overthrown by a coalition opposition which included Accion Democratica and the Communist party.

Prosperity under his administration: Venezuela experienced astonishing material progress under the Perez Jimenez regime; reported a surplus in the national budget in 1954 of $64 million. Petroleum production in that year was at a high of 2,112,000 barrels of oil per day. Fifty-seven percent of the national income was used to build highways, housing projects for workers, schools and hospitals. The Venezuelan Treasury at Perez Jimenez' resignation contained $750 million.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica: "The Perez Jimenez regime concentrated on the development of cities, stimulating the growth of an urban middle class * * * during this period the Nation boasted the highest per capita income among the Central and South American countries."

According to the New York Times: Perez Jimenez was "a man with a mission" who had "dedicated himself to make Venezuela, a tropical underdeveloped country of 6 million inhabitants, the economic and social center of Latin America."

According to Life magazine: The economy under Perez Jimenez "enabled many Venezuelan workers, whose average wages have doubled in 10 years, to replace their rope-soled sandals with shoes, buy canned goods in the supermarkets and satisfy a craving for chicken and ice cream."

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The spectacular economic boom continued unabated. After earmarking an additional $23 million for public works in 1957, the richest country in Latin America looked around for impressive projects on an international scale. The Government pledged money at the United Nations for the proposed Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development * * * it gave credit to Paraguay estimated at $30 million and another $15 million loan for development went to Ecuador."

According to the National City Bank of New York: Venezuela was in sound financial condition, and it distributed to its depositors a report that recommended the country for foreign investments.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "Venezuela (under Perez Jimenez) was never more prosperous. It has new iron mines, manufacturing, a steel mill, oil refinery, new railroads, highways, and ports. The Government enjoys more than a billion dollars a year in revenue from the oil industry alone. This wealth has permitted a spectacular public works program."

PUBLIC WORKS

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The multimillion-dollar income from the foreign petroleum companies completely transformed Caracas and other cities with the largest program of public works ever undertaken anywhere in Latin America. Old buildings were torn down by the hundreds to make way for wide avenues and skyscrapers. Hillside slums were being cleared away and occupants were moving into modern apartments bought on easy terms. Superhighways were carved through the mountains to connect seaports with interior industrial cities. In 10 years, Venezuela quadrupled its highway mileage and had more good roads than Brazil, a country nearly 10 times as large."

Because slums were created by the sudden influx of agricultural workers to the industries in the cities, "the Government organized Banco Obrero, built 10 low-rental apartment houses in 1954 and transferred 30,000 families from shacks into new quarters. Construction was started in 1955 for about 30 more blocks to accommodate 15,000 more people.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "In April 1953, Venezuela adopted a new constitution * * * 2 days later, Marcos Perez Jimenez was elected President. He launched a program of countrywide improvements. In the 1950's, for instance, Venezuela invested hundreds of millions of dollars in public projects such as housing, waterworks, schools, highways, harbor improvements, churches, buildings, and agriculture. Income from petroleum furnished the money for almost all of the projects. Huge housing projects have changed the living habits of thousands of people in the northern highlands. Many people have moved from tiny shacks into comfortable Government-built apartment buildings."

Venezuela encouraged immigration, and more than 340,000 immigrants came from Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and Austria.

Relations with Betancourt: Shortly after Perez Jimenez assumed the Venezuelan presidency, former President Romulo Betancourt started an 8-week tour of South America, making protests and charges against the new regime. Simultaneously, the Accion Democratica and Communist Parties commenced agitation, and this resulted in decrees that outlawed both and made their political activities illegal. The two parties had fomented strikes in the oil industry with a view to crippling it and creating economic crisis. The strikes were accompanied by acts of sabotage and violence on a nationwide basis. Colonel Delgado Chalbaud had been killed in ambush in 1950; there were four attempts on the life of Perez Jimenez in the period from 1952 to 1954.

THE EXTRADITION CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ

BACKGROUND

Mr. Marcos Perez Jimenez served as President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958.

He fled from Venezuela to the Dominican Republic early in 1958 when his government was overthrown. He applied for admission to the United States on March 28, 1958, as a visitor. He entered the United States in a parole status pending determination of his eligibility for admission. On January 7, 1959, he was admitted to the United States as a visitor until February 15, 1959, and that visit was extended to March 13, 1959. Further requests for extension were denied and, when he failed to leave the United States within a reasonable time after expiration of his lawful stay, deportation proceedings were instituted against him. After full hearings, Mr. Perez Jimenez was ordered deported and that determination by the Immigration and Naturalization Service was affirmed on appeal by the Board of Immigration Appeals on September 8, 1959.

EXTRADITION REQUEST

While the deportation proceedings were pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Government of Venezuela, on August 25, 1959, filed a formal complaint in extradition under the United States-Venezuela Extradition Treaty of 1922 and section 3184, title 18, United States Code, seeking the return for prosecution of Mr. Perez Jimenez for alleged complicity in 4 homicides

and for approximately 15 financial crimes such as embezzlement and fraud by which he allegedly obtained in excess of $13 million. He was arrested at Miami pursuant to a warrant issued by the U.S. district court at Miami and was immediately released on bond.

PROCEEDINGS IN U.S. COURTS

The extradition hearing before a U.S. district judge sitting as an extradition magistrate extended over a period of almost 2 years and resulted on June 16, 1961, in the determination by the extradition magistrate that probable cause of Mr. Perez Jimenez' guilt of the financial crimes had been established but that his responsibility for or complicity in the homicides had not been shown. Pursuant to section 3184, title 18, United States Code, the extradition magistrate certified his finding and the record of the extradition hearing to the Secretary of State and ordered the commitment to jail of Mr. Perez Jimenez. He was immediately released on bond pending a decision on his petition for habeas corpus challenging the finding of the extradition magistrate.

Hearings on the habeas corpus petition were heard before a U.S. district judge on August 23 and 24, 1961. At the conclusion of the hearings the district judge found that the extradition proceedings had been conducted in accordance with law, that due process had been accorded Mr. Perez Jimenez, that the evidence presented showed probable cause to believe Mr. Perez Jimenez committed the financial crimes charged, that the crimes charged were crimes enumerated in the treaty between Venezuela and the United States which, had they been committed in this country, would be offenses against our laws and that the offenses were not political in character and thus not exempt from extradition. Accordingly, the petition for habeas corpus was dismissed. Mr. Perez Jimenez was again released under bond pending further order of the court.

Appeal was taken by Mr. Perez Jimenez to the U.S. court of appeals. In a lengthy opinion released on December 12, 1962, the court of appeals affirmed the district court's judgment. Immediately upon such affirmance and on the same day that the decision was announced, the district court, on its own motion, entered an order revoking the bond under which Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty and he was taken into custody. No doubt the action of the court was based, in part, on the consideration that his continued liberty on bond would enable him to flee which might result in this Government being unable to fulfill its treaty obligations should the final decision in the case be that extradition should be granted.

BAIL

The laws of the United States make no provision for bail in an international extradition case. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated that a court's discretion to grant bail in such cases should be exercised only in unusual and extraordinary circumstances prior to the holding of the extradition hearing and that allowance of bail after a finding of probable cause is inconsistent with the extradition laws of the United States. Nevertheless, Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty on bail not only before but after the extradition magistrate found that a proper case for extradition had been made out under the treaty and U.S. law and remained at liberty on bail until first the U.S. district court and then the U.S. court of appeals, on habeas corpus proceedings, had reviewed the case and rendered their decisions which, in effect, affirmed the finding of the extradition magistrate.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

The admission into the United States and the continued presence in the United States of aliens is governed by the laws of the United States, principally the Immigration and Nationality Act. These laws contain no provision according an individual a right to remain in this country because he claims "political asylum." Whether a person in this country is subject to extradition to a foreign country where he is accused of crime is unrelated to his status under the immigration laws or his status as an alleged "political asylee" or whether he has committed a crime in this country but is dependent upon the application of the extradition treaties and related laws of the United States.

EXTRADITION TREATIES AND LAWS

In the extradition treaties the countries agree to surrender, on a reciprocal basis, persons found in one country who are charged in the other country with any of the crimes enumerated in the treaty. These treaties and laws prescribe the procedure which must be followed and the requirements which must be met to obtain the extradition of an alleged fugitive from justice. Under these treaties and U.S. laws the alleged fugitive, whether alien or U.S. citizen, has the opportunity to resist extradition in the courts to the full extent of the law with, in accordance with traditional standards of American justice, the assurance of equal treatment under the law. Among the issues the alleged fugitive may raise in opposition to the request for his extradition is that the offenses charged are political in character and thus not a proper basis for extradition. This was among the issues raised by Mr. Perez Jimenez at the extradition hearing and in the habeas corpus proceedings. The courts found against Mr. Perez Jimenez.

Under the laws of the United States the extradition of an alleged fugitive may be granted only for those offenses for which the extradition magistrate has found probable guilt has been shown. Under the extradition treaties of the United States, including the United States-Venezuela Treaty, a person extradited may be tried only for those offenses for which extradition has been granted. In addition, like most extradition treaties of the United States, the United States-Venezuela Treaty prohibits the punishment for political offenses of persons extradited under the treaty. In the case of Mr. Perez Jimenez, he can be extradited and tried in Venezuela only for the financial crimes for it was only with respect to these crimes that the extradition magistrate, the U.S. district court and the U.S. court of appeals found that the probable guilt of Mr. Perez Jimenez had been shown.

DECISION ON EXTRADITION

Mr. Perez Jimenez may petition the U.S. Supreme Court for review of the decision of the court of appeals. In the event that the final decision of the courts is that extradition is warranted under the laws and the treaty, the determination as to whether Mr. Perez Jimenez' extradition is required under the United States-Venezuelan Treaty will rest with the Secretary of State. In making that determination careful consideration will be given to every aspect of the case.

MR. PEREZ JIMENEZ' ANTICOMMUNIST POSITION

It has been noted that many of the individuals expressing sympathy or support for Mr. Perez Jimenez have pictured him as a stanch anti-Communist. From the standpoint of objectivity, it should be noted as well that Mr. Perez Jimenez, while President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958, headed one of the most brutally repressive and corrupt dictatorships in recent Latin American history.

While the record clearly shows that Mr. Perez Jimenez' government undertook action against many leaders of the Venezuelan Communist Party, it was even more severe in its harassment of democratic opposition groups. Moreover, there were indications in the final years of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship that it was coddling Communists in organized labor, the press, and in education. It apparently did this to make of them a counterfoil to the dominance of democratic opposition political groups in those key fields whom it considered a greater threat to itself than it did the Communists.

As a result of infiltration during the Perez Jimenez dictatorship, which became apparent after the overthrow of that regime in January 1958, the Communist Party of Venezuela emerged more strongly entrenched in labor, journalism, and education than ever before.

Since 1959, under a representative government, democratic political groups have managed to restore their position of dominance in labor, journalism, and education and greatly reduce Communist strength in these fields.

POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF THE VENEZUELAN GOVERNMENT

It has also been noted that many of the persons expressing sympathy for Mr. Perez Jimenez have done so in apparent belief that the present Government of Venezuela is Communist and pro-Communist and seeks to have him extradited to wreak its vengeance on him for his purported anticommunism. The similarity of their allegations suggests that they may be responding to solicitations from an organization or organizations conducting a campaign to discredit the Government of Venezuela and its President, Romulo Betancourt. Their allegations about the present Venezuelan Government are not supported by the facts and are at considerable variance with accurate information which has reached the Department of State from numerous reliable and competent close observers of Venezuela for many years.

The present Venezuelan Government is a coalition of the Democratic Action (AD) Party of President Betancourt, the Social Christian (Christian Democratic or Catholic) COPEI Party and political independents who are among the democratic leaders of the professional and business community.

The former Communist affiliation of President Betancourt during the beginning of his political career in the early 1930's has been common knowledge for many years. However, it is equally well known that he severed his connections with communism more than a quarter of a century ago, subsequently organized his own political movement, the AD Party, and formulated a political program based on democratic concepts of social reform related to the unique character of Venezuela's national problems.

The AD Party in its formative years was influenced by Marxist ideas and some of its leaders have been avowed radical Marxists of the extreme left. However, the leftwing extremist leadership has been expelled from the party or has bolted from it. As presently constituted, the AD, under President Betancourt's leadership, is a nationalistic mixture of moderate social democrat and liberal. It advocates political, social, and economic changes through representative democratic means and does not seek to abolish the free enterprise system or private property. It is a "polyclass" party which stands for basic reforms by constitutional means which permit the participation of all democratic groups in the political process. It does not advocate revolution through class struggle.

Since its founding 23 years ago, the AD Party under Mr. Betancourt has been a bitter political adversary of the Venezuelan Communists and a target of international Communist attack. Mr. Betancourt's firm stand against communism in general and particularly against its most recent manifestation in this hemishpere, as represented by Fidel

Castro, has been clearly and forcefully demonstrated many times during his Presidency.

Mr. Betancourt's government has been subjected to severe and continuing attacks by the Communist Party of Venezuela and an allied left-extremist group which had been expelled from the AD Party. Since late 1961 the Communist Party and its ally, the Movement of the Revolutionary Left, have embarked on an all-out campaign of terrorism, sabotage, crime, and guerrilla warfare to overthrow the Venezuelan Government.

As a result, the Venezuelan Government in May 1962 banned the activities of these two subversive, conspiratorial groups. More recently, the Government petitioned the Supreme Court to declare them illegal on the basis of evidence which it has supplied; and has undertaken increasingly severe and energetic security measures to counter Communist insurgency.

During the recent Cuban crisis, the Venezuelan Government strongly supported the U.S. position and contributed two warships to the naval quarantine of Cuba. In reprisal, Venezuelan Communists severely sabotaged some of the petroleum installations which are Venezuela's economic mainstay. The Venezuelan Government brought this Communist-directed sabotage, on behalf of the Communist Cuban regime, to the attention of the Organization of American States.

Indicative of the opinion of the resident U.S. citizen in Venezuela (about 30,000 in number), the English language Daily Journal of Caracas, Venezuela, whose publishers include several leaders of the U.S. community, carried the following editorial on November 7, 1962, which stated in part:

"North Americans all over the world can expect, these days, to be in the front line, and should not be surprised if Fidelistas and Communists attack them. Their answer should be compounded of composure and commonsense and appreciation of the fact that the vast majority of Venezuelans are with them.

"They can also remember that the President of Venezuela has said that attacks on American companies are attacks on the economy of Venezuela, no more and no less.

"North Americans have good reason to hold their heads high. Their country has been the symbol of the fight against tyranny. And Venezuela has joined it in that fight."

The Communist Cuban regime has been carrying on a propaganda campaign against the Venezuelan Government, and particularly against President Betancourt, that is exceeded in its ferocity and provocation only by the Castro Government's vilification of the United States. The Communist Cuban regime has clearly sided with the terrorist insurrection of the Venezuelan Communists.

A recent communique of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela stated that "the principal enemy of the Venezuelan people today is the government of Betancourt, through which U.S. imperialism and its allies, the local privileged classes, effect their rule. The plenary session of the central committee calls for joint action with all opposition groups against Betancourt." This theme is being echoed by the propaganda organs of international communism.

PRESIDENT BETANCOURT'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Venezuela was the first Latin American country which President Kennedy visited after his inauguration. He went there in December 1961, as a guest of President Betancourt to dramatize the cooperative effort being made by the United States, Venezuela, and the other Latin American countries to accelerate their economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress. The President's trip demonstrated the intense concern of the United States for the programs of the Venezuelan Government aimed at improving the welfare of the greatest number of its people.

President Kennedy recently invited President Betancourt to visit the United States. President Betancourt has accepted this invitation and will come to Washington on February 19 and 20. This visit will enable President Kennedy to reciprocate the hospitality of the visiting chief of state of a country with which the United States has formed so many close and cordial ties. It will also afford the two Presidents an opportunity to exchange views on matters of mutual interest.

The Venezuelan Government of President Betancourt has demonstrated a firm desire to maintain the traditional friendly relations between our countries. Our friendly cooperation has furthered our mutual interest in the following objectives which are the antithesis of international communism: (a) extension of representative democracy, (b) accelerated economic, social, and cultural development within a framework of free institutions, and (c) inter-American cooperation in the defense of the security of this hemisphere against aggression or subversion.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, has demonstrated its active interest in assuring economic and social progress with political stability and with freedom. It apparently is making strong efforts to meet the needs of the Venezuelan people and to strengthen democratic institutions. And it seems firmly determined to maintain the political independence of Venezuela. Such independence, of course, is contrary to the objectives of international communism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests. First, that the distinguished Speaker may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD on the subject of Estonian Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Estonia is one of the three Baltic countries in northeastern Europe, and the Estonians constitute one of three Baltic peoples. With an area of about 18,000 square miles, and a population of not much more than 1 million, Estonians have always figured as one of the smallest nationality groups in all of Europe. But to these gallant and gifted people mere size in numbers has not been of any real account. They have always faced their far more powerful enemies, invariably many times their size, with courage and determination, convinced that theirs has been a righteous and sacred cause. They have fought courageously against all their foes, and even in defeat they have made themselves glorious and great. In the course of their eventful history, when it was impossible for them to maintain their national independence, they refused to bow their heads to their conquerors and overlords. During the two centuries before 1918 they were subjected to cruel treatment at the hands of Russia's callous agents. They were fiercely persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and the ideas they advocated, but these dauntless champions of freedom and liberty could neither be silenced nor subdued. They clung to their ideals until the time came for their freedom. In 1917 when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they saw their chance, seized upon it, and proclaimed their national independence on February 24 of 1918.

Since then world-rocking events have brought about many revolutionary changes everywhere. But the disheartening change brought about in the first years of the last war ushered in a new tragedy to many peoples. Unfortunate Estonians could not defy their fate. Early in 1940 Estonia was invaded by the Red army, occupied, and soon it was made part of the Soviet Union. In the course of the war the Estonians exchanged their Communist overlords for Nazi invaders, but that did not change their lot; they suffered equally under both. Toward the end of the war the Communists returned with more force and unbridled fury, and there they remain to this day. They have turned once independent and free Estonia into a large prison camp where all Estonians work for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. They are completely cut off from the free world, and we really know little of their actual status. Without any personal and political freedom, under abominable conditions, they lead a miserable life. But they have not lost heart, and they still hope for their deliverance from misery and servitude, from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we ardently hope and fervently pray for their freedom and independence.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Second, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and March 1, 4, and 5.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is going to be the business of the House on those days? Does the gentleman have any idea whether there will be important legislation before the House on those days?

Mr. ALBERT. There may well be important legislation on some of those days, but I would like to advise the gentleman the reason for this request, as I understand it, from the Committee on Banking and Currency is to do just exactly what the gentleman wants done, and that is to process the committee part of legislation and get it to the floor so that we can proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we all want to proceed with the business of the House, but not at the expense of Members being in committees and not on the floor of the House when important legislation is being considered.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman recognizes that this permission for the committee to sit extends only to such time as

the House is engaged in general debate and not while the House is considering legislation in Committee of the Whole on amendments under the 5-minute rule or during the consideration by the House of any other matter pertaining to the actual processing of bills and other legislative matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not object to this request but later when the legislative machinery starts to roll, the gentleman from Iowa will be constrained to object to projecting unanimous consent requests of this nature into the unknown future.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand from the press reports that the matter to be taken up by the Committee on Banking and Currency is this so-called mass transportation bill that is to cost a minimum of $500 million to take care of some of the transportation problems of some of the large cities at the cost of all the taxpayers of the Nation. Is that the bill to be considered?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I am not prepared to advise specifically what legislation will be involved here, but like the gentleman, and like the party of the gentleman, we are all concerned with the problems of the city as we are concerned with the problems of other elements of our society.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Some of us are concerned just a little bit with the budget situation and the situation of the Federal Treasury too. There are some of us who may not be quite as inspired with the idea that we ought to pay for mass transportation of the great cities as some of the rest of you. I am just wondering if this is an attempt to speed up consideration of legislation of this type, and whether or not it should not follow the orderly procedure of handling legislation here in the House so that Members would have an opportunity to attend hearings and know exactly what is going on. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not prepared to answer the specific question of the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I will object, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not press the other consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. I renew the request made on behalf of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the latter request until I know what the committee is going to take up and discuss during the time the House is in session on other important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. When that information is furnished me I will discuss the withdrawal of the objection.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 25

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the several bills out of the Committee on Ways and Means which were scheduled for today are being put over until tomorrow at the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I may add that two of these bills will come at a later date, H.R. 2862 and House Resolution 57.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to advise the House that the first order of business on Wednesday will be the supplemental appropriation bill, commodity credit, Public Law 480, and also that on Wednesday the Committee on House Administration will bring up several resolutions, including the following:

House Resolution 239, Agriculture.

House Resolution 146, Armed Services.

House Resolution 204, Banking and Currency; Housing.

House Resolution 202, District of Columbia.

House Resolution 243, Foreign Affairs.

House Resolution 80, Government Operations.

House Resolution 165, House Administration.

House Resolution 135, Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 226, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 35, and House Resolution 100, Judiciary.

House Resolution 30, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

House Resolution 152, Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 236, and House Resolution 237, Public Works.

House Resolution 177, Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 222, Small Business.

House Resolution 249, Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 74, Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 227, Ways and Means.

There may be some additional resolutions from this committee which will meet in executive session on Tuesday. If more are added they may be programed for Wednesday and the balance of the week also.

I may advise, Mr. Speaker, that these resolutions may not necessarily be called up in the order in which I have announced them, and I would like also to advise the House again that any further program for the week will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I suggest that he submit the request which I attempted to make earlier and to which the gentleman from Ohio objected.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be allowed to sit during general debate in addition to the time already granted, on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and on March 1, 4, and 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what bills are coming up?

Mr. PATMAN. We have the Export-Import Bank hearings going on now. We will also take up mass transportation Wednesday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Wednesday of this week?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. That will go over to the end of this period. This is just for afternoons.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What length of time will the gentleman have on the mass transportation bill?

Mr. PATMAN. We will have probably a week of hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that a statement we can depend on?

Mr. PATMAN. We will finish the hearings on March 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. Will the chairman arrange for an opportunity to be given to those persons who oppose this proposition?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. This morning one came in and wanted to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will not be a hearing in which the proponents alone will have the opportunity to be heard?

Mr. PATMAN. No. We have fair hearings in our committee, and we hear both sides. We give every witness an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How much money is involved?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the terms of all the different bills. There are several bills. It is quite a sum.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the amount mentioned is $500 million to start the program.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. But I think it is contemplated that only a small part will be available the first year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the first year. Then the total cost will run into millions?

Mr. PATMAN. The $500 million is the outside figure. Only about $10 million will be taken up the first year. I would not like to be committed to that, however.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will run into the millions of dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. It will run into millions of dollars, yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the chairman wants to have the hearing and will assure the House there will be at least 1 week of hearings, with an opportunity for opponents to be heard also, I have no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I so assure the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be allowed to sit during general debate in the afternoon session of the House for the balance of the week.

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

There was no objection.

SPACE PROGRAM—ANYTHING GOES?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, news coverage in recent days, which states that NASA has failed to entice away from the Air Force two of its top space aces with hefty pay increases, fails to give a true picture of what is happening. There is another word for this. It is called pirating. NASA has unlimited funds and too little concern for cost. This action must be called disregard for the American taxpayer. Military space programs are, in the opinion of many, even more important than NASA's programs. Bidding by Government agencies against each other for personnel is a bad practice for all the Government. When that takes place, the only answer is for each agency or service to try to outbid the other and to do so each must constantly justify to Congress higher grades and bigger salaries. We, in the United States, seem to have gotten ourselves into a dangerous attitude over space efforts. Anything goes as long as it is for space. This is not conducive to sound accomplishment and it plays havoc with budget problems. Someone upstairs needs to talk to the space people about realism.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 24th day of February, the Estonian Republic would have celebrated its 45th anniversary.

I use the term "would have celebrated" since obviously, the Estonian people now held in bondage by the Soviet Union are not free to celebrate the legitimate anniversary of their freedom. Certainly, they are no longer a free people but do look forward to the day when their legitimate desire for self-determination will once again produce a free and independent Estonia.

However, it is noteworthy that Estonian refugees from Soviet persecution scattered around the continents of the world continue to observe this anniversary and remain a vigorous, forceful, and effective voice in the maintenance of the spirit of the captive Estonian people. Their heroic struggle for freedom and their perseverance equip them well to continue the struggle; their militant anticommunism and their desire to be free from Soviet Russian oppression make them one of the leading voices calling for restoration of freedom to all the peoples of the captive nations.

In the United States, the Estonian National Committee serves as a very effective spokesman for Estonian groups, and their counterparts in other lands are equally effective.

In paying my respects to the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Estonian Republic, I voice the hope and the prayer not only of the Estonian people but of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, that the people of Estonia and the other nations which suffer tyranny under Communist rule, will soon see the day when their freedom is restored. To this end they and we pledge ourselves.

PARTISANSHIP IN SUMMER STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure last week that the White House was considering applying a patronage clearance system to summer student employment has evoked considerable newspaper comment by impartial observers.

Foremost among these are three articles which under unanimous consent I will include following my remarks. The first of these is the original story on the patronage clearance operation appearing in the Washington Star of Wednesday, February 20, and written by Joseph Young. The second is an editorial condemning the proposed practice which appeared in the February 21 Washington Star. Finally, there is an excellent column by John Cramer, which was published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 22.

In his column, Mr. Cramer calls attention to the need for a complete reevaluation of summer employment practices within the Federal Government. He contends that of the 10,000 or 12,000 positions available, the majority are make-work jobs which benefit neither the student nor the agency. The disclosures of last week, and Mr. Cramer's comments, have led me to several conclusions.

First, there is a need to take as many of these summer jobs out of the patronage pie as possible, placing them under a merit hiring system within civil service, with greater cooperation between the hiring agents and school placement officers. I am certain that the number of partisan policy making positions open to summer employees is rather limited in number.

Second, an evaluation of the reasons for hiring summer help should be made. If Mr. Cramer's observations are correct, and I have occasion to believe they are, a majority of the present jobs are unjustifiable, unless simply excused as a patronage tool or a madework project. I would assume that an investigation by the General Accounting Office would be appropriate if the executive branch does not put its own house in order. To my knowledge, no appropriations measure has ever passed this body which authorized any agency to set up a summer version of the Youth Conservation Corps or the WPA.

There are legitimate reasons, of course, for some hiring. One obvious reason is to take up the slack left by vacationing employees. Another is a commendable effort to interest young people in a Government career, through an internship approach. Some agencies plan their work in such a way that with respect to routine matters a backlog is built up which is erased by summer staff members.

Third, there is a need to provide the serious minded student with opportunities to enrich his knowledge of the process of Government and the science of politics and administration. White House seminars, filled with 1,500 students, with famous New Frontiersmen as speakers, are inadequate substitutes for informal, small, seminar sessions under the guidance of an objective organization such as the American Political Science Association or the younger member section of the Federal Bar Association. The number of students motivated to participate in such seminars would be small in relation to the past White House program participants, but the rewards both for the student and, ultimately, the country, would be infinitely greater.

That is why in December of last year, I suggested such an approach to the American Political Science Association. The association has expressed a lively interest in the possibilities. I hope that this program would not be limited to those participating in the White House program, but would include summer students working with Congress, the political parties, and private associations with an interest in Government. However, cooperation by the White House personnel, particularly Mrs. Dorothy Davies, is essential if the program is to have a chance at success.

There are some who may wonder at the amount of response students would show for such an activity. Those who participated in last year's program, while interested in some phases, did not find it entirely to their liking. Even the so-called representatives from among the students in each department who were asked to evaluate and make suggestions in reports to Mrs. Davies, I am sure, were not completely happy with the program as their reports would disclose.

I should like to call attention, furthermore, to the cocurricular programs of seminars and speakers within our colleges and universities. Many of them, such as the Yale Law School Forum and the UCLA public administration seminar program, are student run. They all suffer from two obstacles: first, the difficulty of getting speakers who are not, generally, in close proximity to the campuses; and second, the competition with regular school work for the intellectual interests and time of the student.

A summer program in Washington, D.C., nearly eliminates these obstacles. The availability of participants is obvious. As the excitement of the first contact with government work wears off, and routine becomes the rule rather than the exception, there are many students who would welcome voluntary, informal, intellectual opportunities in the evening which are missing during the rest of the week.

Hopefully, the White House will see fit to cooperate in this educational experiment. Those who have instituted the spoils system with respect to summer jobs should be warned that no amount of cooperation with impartial outside groups will cover up this disgraceful partisanship. The American college student is not so insensitive that such a cynical display will go unheeded. Indeed, I can think of no better way to discourage qualified graduates from seeking Government employment in the future.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE TO CONTROL STUDENT JOB PATRONAGE—CIVIL SERVICE NOT TOLD OF MEETING WHICH SET UP CLEARANCE SYSTEM

(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student hails, plus the college he is attending (if any), will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure "coordination" in order that the agencies could make best use of the student's talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to pass civil service exams for clerical, typists, and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

It's no secret that a goodly portion of the summer student jobs are filled on a personal patronage basis each year. Government officials—political and career—have hired their own sons and daughters as well as the children of friends or Members of Congress. However, the Civil Service Commission has been careful to certify only the top qualifiers on the student trainee exam.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

This year a half-dozen bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve the same objective.

In discussing the White House job clearence system, Mrs. Davies said it was a move to channel the best possible talent to the places in Government where it could be used most effectively.

She said that, for example, if an agency finds that its summer job vacancies are all filled up, a place for a bright student could be found in another Government agency through a coordinated placement system set up in the White House.

Mrs. Davies refused to answer directly whether the program also involved political patronage, other than saying that there always has been some patronage in summer student jobs in Government.

Presumably, students still will have to pass an exam to get the summer jobs.

Last year's Government summer job program for students was given great emphasis by the administration, with President Kennedy and other top Government officials addressing the students.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 21, 1963]

PATRONAGE AT A PRICE

"The Democratic administration will establish and enforce a code of ethics to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service and to make it more attractive to the ablest men and women" (1960 Democratic platform).

Now, the above is a passel of mighty pretty words which, canned in July 1960, may become downright indigestible in July 1963. That's the time of year when Washington is invaded by all those bright young students who spend the summer picking up a few bucks working for, and learning about, their Government.

This summer, Federal Columnist Joe Young tells us, they are going to learn more than they bargained for. They are going to be indoctrinated into the political boss system, known otherwise simply as patronage. And their lessons are coming from the very Olympia of plum dispensaries, the White House.

Somebody there, we are told, is going to save the Civil Service Commission the trouble of deciding what students will work where. Being set up at the White House level is a sort of superemployment service, unhampered by rules and regulations, to which agency personnel officials have been told they should channel all job applications. Avowedly, this system will guarantee that the talents of each applicant will be used to best advantage. But it doesn't take a political genius to perceive that the talents of a worthy Democrat's son may just happen to be more worthy than those of a misguided outsider.

No exception in the White House lottery is planned for a select group of student trainees who expect to make Government their careers. These are the young men and women the Government hopes to attract "to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service." But it wouldn't be too surprising if the trainees, after learning the true facts of political life, packed up their shattered ideals and departed forever.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 22, 1963]

CLEARANCE PLAN ON JOBS IS SCORED

(By John Cramer)

As might be expected, there's outcry against the word that the White House plans to clear the youngsters appointed next summer to temporary, student-type jobs in the Washington area.

The first cry comes from Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey.

He's most concerned about the impact on the so-called summer interns, graduate students and serious undergraduates contemplating Government as a career.

He calls the White House move an attempt to "brainwash the American college student." He says the loss to "students, faculty, and the nation will be incalcuable."

INSTRUMENTAL

Representative WIDNALL goes on to say that he, personally, was instrumental in getting the American Political Science Association interested in conducting after-hours seminars next summer for student interns.

The APSA, he says, was ready and eager. The White House, he says, didn't show much interest.

He said:

"Although this is not the first time that such a political clearing house operation has been employed by the administration in terms of summer jobs, it is the first to be enacted openly and on an overall scale."

Mr. WIDNALL can be nothing but right.

The clearance program obviously is the invention of White House people with time on their hands. Nothing better to do and little judgment.

NOT PLEASANT

The truth about summer, student-type jobs in the Washington area—about 11,000 last year—isn't pleasant.

The truth is that about 5,000 jobs may be justified. The rest are padded and made jobs.

For years, Federal agencies have made it a practice to save up routine tasks, and unencumbered funds, so as to be able to provide summer employment to the sons and daughters of agency bigshots and others favored.

There is excuse for hiring summer replacements for necessary employees who are on vacation.

There's no excuse for the summer job racket which has grown up, or for the ill-advised White House attempt to take advantage of it.

BECKWORTH BILL

The worst solution of all has been offered by Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Democrat, of Texas.

Representative BECKWORTH has Congress all set to vote a Texas millionaire bill to control the summer jobs.

Under it, the jobs would be allocated to the various States on the basis of population.

Members of Congress find it hard to vote against such a proposition.

But what they'll be voting for is a proposal that the summer jobs be restricted to the sons and daughters of the wealthy youngsters whose parents can well afford to pay their college bills—kids who think a work-play vacation in Washington would be a lot of fun.

Many could find equally well-paying summer Government jobs in their own localities. In the longrun, happily, the White House clearance program is all to the good. It focuses attention on a messy situation which needs cleaning up.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discriminations against married female employees.

Under present law, the widower of a deceased female Government employee must be dependent upon her for his support in order to receive an annuity in the event of her death. However, the widow of a deceased male employee can receive such an annuity regardless of need.

Similarly, under the Employees Health Benefit Act, a married female employee with nondependent husband must pay a greater share of her health insurance premium than the male employee, regardless of his wife's need. For instance, a married woman whose husband is self-employed pays a monthly premium of $13.42 for her family plan health insurance, while a male employee pays only $10.70 for the same insurance, regardless of his wife's need.

I hope favorable consideration will be given to this legislation to eliminate the present discrimination that has existed since the enactment of this legislation.

THE DEATH OF A PEACE CORPS MAN

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues in this distinguished body will be moved, as I have been, with an article from the Quincy, Mass., newspaper written by Nicholas Gage.

The article describes in detail the personality and devotion of Peace Corps Volunteer Dave Mulholland who died in the Philippines while working for the Corps.

Dave's death was a tragic occurrence coming as it did at such an early time in his life. Yet, it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, to reflect upon what he accomplished in this short time.

Shortly before his death, as Mr. Gage relates, he wrote to a Filipino friend and urged him to "Try someday to do something that is immortal, and perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

This Peace Corps man, Mr. Speaker, did do something that was immortal, and I pause here today to pay tribute to this courageous young man who did not, indeed could not, give up the battle of decency, charity, and genuine human fellowship among men.

As one of the earliest and most active supporters of the Peace Corps, I sincerely hope that every Member of this body will read the moving story of David Mulholland's life.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD, this article about his life from the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger of December 21, 1962:

PEACE CORPS WORK IS QUINCY MAN'S EPITAPH

(By Nicholas Gage)

(NOTE.—Nicholas Gage, author of this article, was a close friend of the late David Mulholland's when both of them worked for the Worcester Evening Gazette. He worked with him just a year before Mr. Mulholland died in the Philippines as a member of the Peace Corps. Mr. Gage gathered much of the material for this article from the personal letters and mementos of the Mulholland family in Quincy.)

"Try someday to do some little thing that's immortal," Dave Mulholland wrote a Filipino friend. "Perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

REACHED GOAL

In an abbreviated life Dave Mulholland found his immortality and purpose in a novel experiment called the Peace Corps. He was the first to sacrifice his life to this idea in the Philippines and became a "martyr to peace" and a symbol of quiet heroism and dedication.

He was among the first to join the Peace Corps and was sent to a "hardship post" in southern Philippines in October of 1961 as an educational aid. When schools closed for the summer in April of this year, he refused the vacation due him to help start the first free summer camp for children in the Philippines and head a journalism seminar for high school teachers.

The unrestrained energy he poured into these and other projects began to undermine his health and he was offered a less strenuous position at Peace Corps headquarters at Manila. He refused to abandon his work. Shortly after, he contracted amoebic dysentary and died June 10 in a Manila Air Force Hospital from a resulting liver infection. He was 23.

Just a year before, Dave was working with me on the reporting staff of the Evening Gazette in Worcester, Mass. He was lanky and boyish but his character embodied a mature sensitivity and perceptiveness that touched those who knew him.

He had seldom left Massachusetts—he was born and grew up in Quincy and joined the Worcester paper following graduation from Tufts University in Medford—but he had a hungry concern for the whole world.

SHY, BUT STRONG

He was basically shy, despite his strong convictions, but was quickly and deeply moved by sincerity and friendship. We would often have lunch at a Greek restaurant where Dave was always enthuastically received by the Greek immigrants who frequented it. They would joke with him uninhibitedly, offer him wine or coffee, teach him Greek card games. Such spontaneous gestures never ceased to delight and amaze him.

But what marked Dave Mulholland was a rare combination of two qualities—an anger at things wrong and a drive to do something about them. He singlehandedly took on John Birch Society supporters in Worcester County when he was with the paper. The group sponsored weekly discussions in the county on anti-Americanism based on Birchite invectives. Dave attended every meeting, never allowing any point of extremism to pass unchallenged. "The Mulholland Crusade," we called it in the city-room.

He took the first Peace Corps exams and was accepted in late July of 1961. "I feel like I've been in prep school for 22 years, and I'm finally getting acceptance to life," he said.

He left for special training at Pennsylvania State University July 27; the 6-week course was an academic nightmare he told his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Mulholland of 29 French Street, Quincy, when he returned home for 10 days in late September. There were classes from morning to evening, 7 days a week. Those who didn't wash out were notified during the home visit.

"David was so anxious," his mother told me, "he never left the house until the acceptance telegrams came."

RECALLED WELCOME

With 218 other volunteers, he arrived in the Philippines October 12 after a long plane trip and was greeted by a vicious rainstorm and "the wildest, most wonderful reception ever imagined. All along the route," he wrote home, "school kids were lined up, waving flags, shouting 'Mabuhay' (welcome) and shoving school notebooks at us for autographs. All this in a rainstorm."

He was assigned as an educational aid at the elementary school in Ilog, an isolated barrio (small town) surrounded by a river, about 350 miles from Manila, at Negroes Occidental Province in southern Philippines. "I have been told this is a poor, depressed, disease ridden and generally undesirable 'hardship post,'" he wrote. "I have found only sincerity and unbelievable hospitality."

But the misery was there. Shortly after arriving, a group of volunteers found a young girl on the road, dead from malnutrition. As they placed her on the bier for the funeral, her jaw swung open and her mouth released a mucous ball packed with worms.

CHILDREN MOVED HIM

"It was the children that got David," his mother said. "He would ask his classes about a missing student. "Oh, he died," they would tell him. "It pains me to watch these kids come to school shoeless and pale with hunger," he wrote in one of the four letters he sent me from the Philippines.

"I have to travel 3 miles to get to school," he said. "I ride a bike to the river, put it in a banca (dugout canoe with outriggers), cross the river and ride through sugarcane fields to school. For someone whose only communion with nature was the Boston Common, this is quite an adventure.

"I am teaching at the elementary school in Ilog, assisting native teachers under conditions less than ideal. The reader I use in one of my classes was published in 1923.

Students are provided only desks in schools here and must furnish their own chairs."

He started a chair-building campaign to alleviate the shortage, volunteer John Lagomarsino, who was one of Dave's closest friends, reports from the Philippines. There were 7 teachers instructing 300 students in the crowded school. Dave taught part of his sixth grade class in the schoolyard to avoid the congestion.

He reached the children from the first. "Call me Dave" he told his pleasantly shocked students, forged in the rigid protocol of Philippine schools. "He delighted them by going to their desks and sitting near them while he taught," a friend wrote his parents.

When Dave arrived at the school the day before Christmas vacation began, each class presented him with a gift. "I received from one class a cellophane bag of four soda crackers, a face cloth from another, five pearl eggs, a handkerchief, a bar of soap. That little bag of soda crackers from grade 5 is among the most precious gifts I have ever received."

With the arrival of Christmas, Dave became the town hero. It is the custom of Filipinos in towns and villages to build a nativity scene at Christmas time for display in the plaza. Judges travel from town to town and give prizes to the best efforts.

The nativity scene in Ilog never won a prize. It was traditionally carved from wood and therefore small. Dave suggested this time they make a big one by using papier mache figures. Everyone agreed and placed him in charge of the project.

"In my enthusiasm, I forgot I didn't know anything about papier mache," he wrote his mother. "Fortunately, I had an old science text which gave instructions. * * *"

When the project was finished, he was asked to lead the dedication procession. The judges gave it third prize for the area. Ilog was ecstatic and so was Dave. "Unlike the United States," he wrote, "where a town decorates by buying the latest plastic materials and hires workmen to put them up, here everyone contributes and everyone takes pride. One can say, 'I made Joseph's lantern;' another, 'I painted the donkey;' 'That's my star.'"

RECOGNIZED PROBLEMS

Dave recognized the particular qualities of the Filipinos and fought their weaknesses. When the parent-teachers group which virtually controls progress in Philippine schools, showed little energy in improving conditions in Ilog, he called the local group together.

"Today you face not the challenge of an invading army," he told them in terms they understood, "not the fury of a raging river, but a challenge perhaps less obvious, but every bit as threatening * * * the threat of complacency, the temptation to resign to defeat." They responded.

As the school year came to a close (in April at the Philippines because of early hot weather), Dave prepared for completion exercises. The salutarian in his sixth grade class missed rehearsals for a week and Dave went looking for him. He found him working in a sugarcane field covered with ashes from the waste fire he was tending in 110° temperature.

The boy told him he had to work if he wanted to go on in school. Dave knew his family would not accept his personal help. ("They are painfully proud here"), so he set up a scholarship fund for the boy. He did the same for others, sending one to a university and hoping to send others to America.

"He saved what little we could send him to give the scholarships," his mother told me. "It only costs $35 for a boy to go to college for a year in the Philippines." With contributions from friends, his parents are expanding the scholarship program Dave established.

When school ended in April, he dismissed all suggestions of rest and exhausted his strength in two new projects.

With 17 volunteers, he helped establish Camp Brotherhood—the first free summer camp in the Philippines. "The Government gave us a plot of land by the site of a volcano and left the rest to us." The volunteers built a mess hall and swimming pool, set up tents for the boys, shelters for nature study and handicrafts, and quarters for the staff.

MATURE JUDGMENT

While working at Camp Brotherhood, he also taught journalism to high school teachers at a summer seminar at La Salle College. "Though he had a boyish look," a student remembered, "he was respected. His judgment was mature."

The endless work he put into Camp Brotherhood, the journalism seminar, and his scholarship program soon began to have its affect on Dave's health. But when he was offered a less demanding post at Peace Corps headquarters, he quickly refused. "I have decided," he wrote a friend, "I would rather stay at my assignment. I have projects and commitments I would not cancel."

Soon after he contracted dysentery and was rushed to Clark Air Force Base in Manila. His parents flew to him. He began to show signs of improvement, but his condition suddenly turned and he died at noon on June 10.

Two hours before his death, he asked his doctors when he could return to his work in Ilog. "I have much to do there," he told them.

In one of his last letters he wrote prophetically: "Maybe I will die in the Philippines. It seems a good place to die."

His death was felt by everyone who knew him and many who recognized the significance of his sacrifice, including President Kennedy, Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver, U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines William E. Stevenson, Philippines President Macapagal, and Vice President Emannueal Palaez, who offered Dave Mulholland's most fitting epitaph:

"He was a martyr to the cause of winning the peace."

EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE CLASH OF IDEAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years the clash of ideas between the executive branch and the legislative branch has dominated our political history. Thinking back over this period, one remembers best the Supreme Court packing, growth of executive initiative in legislative programs, the constant battle between the legislator and the bureaucrat for control of the Government and the direction government is to take.

Mr. Speaker, it is also apparent that in this battle of ideas and approach to government, the legislative branch is badly outnumbered and outfought in getting its ideas to the people. Consider the multitude of executive agencies, the wealth of funds available to them, the organization at national and lower levels and the ability to concentrate this tremendous organization to attain the goals of the executive leaders.

I think it is safe to say that over 100,000 employees in the executive branch are in the business of supplying information to the public, perhaps twice that number. I do not say that they are all public relations and mass media experts. Far from it. But they are there, and they are in business, and they constitute a powerful and frighteningly large force for propaganda.

We are faced under this administration—even more than in previous administrations of either party—with an admitted view that managed news is here to stay. This admission has caused concern among the American people.

We find the Inter-American Press Association's executive committee condemning the concept of "managed news and news as weaponry." According to press reports, this group finds such practices "endanger the very foundations of a free and responsible press."

The president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Lee Hills, said Friday that the administration should end the debate over "managed news" by disavowing publicly its use as part of national policy. And Arthur Krock of the New York Times, writing in the March issue of Fortune magazine, accuses the President, of whom he is "absolutely personally fond," of managing the news with "cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history."

There is concern in Congress also over this managed-news policy. It carries one step further the practices of earlier administrations to promote and publicize the administration position to the exclusion of all others. And for the first time, it now uses not only top political appointees here in Washington, but tries to force career civil service employees to promote the party line.

Some may shrug this off as part of the art of politics, and to a degree that is the case. But under this administration I fear it has been carried to new lengths and is being extended to "friendly" members of the press to the exclusion of "uncooperative" reporters.

It is also being carried to new lengths in the degree to which various Government agencies through their press releases, statements, and leaks to the press mimic the New Frontier approach to economic, legislative, or other areas.

Indeed, as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, has said:

> The American taxpayer is the victim of the greatest publicity snow job of our time.

Douglass Cater in his book, "The Fourth Branch of Government," wrote in 1960 about congressional efforts to investigate and expose secrecy in the executive branch. But, he commented:

> A more fruitful course for government would be to consider how the flow of information may be better timed and coordinated so that the public receives a balanced story. Too often the real damage caused by public disclosures comes from the fact that the information is partial and biased.

Cater also wrote:

> More and more in recent years the Washington correspondent has been aware of the managed news event which he is expected to report without paying attention to the props and staging devices.

It could well be argued that all publicity efforts by executive agencies are

illegal, for we find in title 4, United States Code, this language:

No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose (sec. 54).

Congress has concerned itself from time to time about these activities, as found in these comments from "Secrecy and Publicity" by Francis E. Rourke, written in 1961:

Over the years Congress has used a variety of techniques in an effort to curb what it regards as improper activitiy on the part of executive agencies in the field of publicity, including prohibitions upon the employment of publicity experts, legislation forbidding certain Government agencies from sending information through the mail except in response to specific requests from the public, and restrictions upon the use of appropriated funds for public relations activity. None of these barriers to executive publicity has been altogether effective as is evident from the fact that it has proven necessary to reenact such restrictions so frequently over the past half-century, and no one has ever been prosecuted for violating any of these statutes. The ban on the employment of publicity experts, for example, has been commonly evaded by giving these employees somewhat different titles, including information specialist, director of public relations, and chief educational officer.

The first Hoover Commission studied this area, faced facts, and reached the conclusion that no matter what you call it, Government information is controlled. To quote from the Hoover Commission:

All programs of education by the Government tend eventually to reflect official thought, official opinion and official aims. In these circumstances, the function of education inevitably is diluted by the pressures of politics and propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, thoughtful reporters and commentators of all shades of political thought have examined this situation. We are presently faced with a President who has the know-how, personality, family and staff to dominate national publicity. James Reston of the New York Times summed up this situation in these words:

It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

Reston pointed out that Congress has been overshadowed by the Executive in the news field. He expressed concern for the views of the loyal opposition. It is an opposition which received 48 percent of the votes cast in the recent congressional elections and within a hair of 50 percent of the votes for President. Yet it is an opposition that is up against a well-planned, well-financed—by tax dollars—and well-executed publicity and propaganda program of benefit solely to the legislative and economic goals of the executive branch.

David Lawrence comments that "criticism was never more important to the administration and to the country" and states what we all must certainly agree with—that voters want to know "the real impact of national and international policies on their own lives and on the future of their children."

It is impossible to determine just how many persons are involved in the publicity apparatus of the executive branch. Estimates in recent years as to the size of the information and/or publicity staffs in executive agencies range from 1,400 to over 100,000. It is difficult to determine, because each survey has its own guidelines.

But as I have said, in my judgment there are at least 100,000 tax-supported Federal employees who spend at least a portion of their time propagandizing the voters, and the vast majority of them are propagandizing in such a way as to try and make a favorable impression for the executive branch and its programs.

Now I do not stand here and claim for 1 minute that each day President John F. Kennedy now or any other President in the past issues his secret orders for the day's publicity campaign, and that hundreds of mimeograph machines, teletypes and eager messengers then spread the word throughout official Washington and to the far reaches of the executive empires. Far from it.

My point, and it has been made by those much closer to the news business than I am, is that there is this huge propaganda information publicity apparatus in being; I do not think there is argument about that. And it can be and is being used consciously or otherwise to promote the legislative program, economic and political theories, and odd ideas in some cases of the top echelon in the executive branch.

Let me refer to Thomas J. Bennett, who spent some time on this matter and devoted his doctoral thesis to the subject of Government publicity. Dr. Bennett wrote just last year in his thesis:

Most of those interviewed agreed that two factors contribute to the de facto uniformity of administration public pronouncements. First of all, although there is little or no coordination of public information officers, there is close consultation among their superiors, at least in the case of the agencies that are properly part of the executive. It makes little difference whether Webster at Agriculture is in touch with Manning at Treasury, if their immediate superiors, from whom they take their orders, and upon whose pleasure their positions depend, meet regularly.

Dr. Bennett put it on the line for us later in his thesis:

It would seem from this that the testimony of the newsmen and the publicists interviewed, which indicated a lack of formal centralization of Federal publicity, was correct in adding that such centralization is unnecessary in view of the localization of issues within a few agencies. It no longer seems unreasonable to speak of the single voice of the Federal Government.

And he winds it up this way:

It must be concluded, therefore, that the publicity operation of the National Government is big enough, active enough, and important enough to warrant concern by the critics.

Let me refer now to the New Leader. In an article in 1960 concerning interservice rivalry, the comment was made in its pages:

What is more, the chief consequence of successfully stifling all public demonstrations of interservice controversy would be the exposure of a single administration view of national security policy. In an area of governmental activity where the executive holds all the trump cards, where the requirements of security classification can be used to bury legitimate opposition within the Government, where there is no pressure group that can make a meaningful impact on the policy process without help from the executive departments, and where such a tremendous part of national resources are being devoted, democratic controls over executive power would become weaker than they are already.

A responsible opposition is necessary in this country, as it is in every country and under any form of government where the people decide their course, directly or indirectly through their representatives. It is the constitutional duty of Congress as a full partner in the Federal Government to explore and develop the alternatives, to present them to the people, and to cause and encourage full discussion of such matters. When only one side is present, when the alternatives are stifled, when one view is preached from all sides, there is not the choice available for the people. Yet one of the most common expressions in this country is that there are two sides to every story.

There might be little we in Congress can do, no matter what party we belong to or what party controls the administration, to effectively and truly cut back the executive's information-publicity-propaganda staffs and activities.

But certainly we should allow full debate in our own processes, full development of alternatives by the minority, full exposure to the people of the two or even more sides to every story. To do otherwise is an indication that the majority is afraid of the other side, that the minority has right on its side.

And I must remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that there are other battles than those between the parties, or between major blocs in the Congress. There is this constant battle, pulling and tugging, between the executive and legislative branches. In this battle all in Congress need to be alert to what is happening to the constitutional rights of this equal partner.

The people are being brainwashed by the Executive's tremendous power of publicity, propaganda, and persuasion to believe that it is time to change the historic proposition that the President proposes and Congress disposes.

How important is this presentation of both sides? It has been called the basis of representative government by a former Senator:

An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government. Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of the democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine, and when necessary, to criticize, its government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy.

So said Senator John F. Kennedy in 1960.

In his new book, "Washington Cover-Up," Clark Mollenhoff assesses the importance of information about government:

No single factor is more important to the strength of our democracy than the free flow

of accurate information about the government's operation. The citizen in a democracy must know what his government is doing, or he will lack the soundest basis for judging the candidates and the platforms of our political parties.

A recent issue of the Economic Council Letter was addressed to the problems of Congress in this tug of war with the executive branch. It commented:

As we have said repeatedly, the executive branch of the American Government has been operating, since 1933, at an accelerating rate, above the Constitution and the law. The only power in the Nation which can stand against a militant executive establishment with unlimited resources of men and money, is the Congress.

A great many arguments can be raised against this statement, but they have no validity. When all is said and done, the only political force which can oppose the growth of governmental absolutism is the body directly representing the people not in government.

It is possible Congress may not be able to stand against the increasing pressure of big government. The answer to that is known to no living man. It is true Congress cannot stand alone. It must have the support of the people. But the people cannot come to Washington and tell the bureaucrats what to do. From election to election the voters are dependent on their representatives to speak for them.

We said in our last council letter that the planners (who do control executive policymaking) are making a revolutionary change from limited to unlimited government without our knowledge or consent. Of necessity, the planners are engaged in a war against Congress. But Congress does not yet realize it is engaged in a war with the planners.

It is good for responsible political leaders to avoid factionalism, or anything that smacks of it, as long as possible. But if the planners do not desist from their attacks, someone must come to grips with them. They refuse to settle the issue by open and free debate.

How can a Congress made up of two Houses and nearly 600 Members come to grips with a hierarchical executive branch which operates under a command structure not unlike an army, and supported by a propaganda machine and militant pressure groups equal to those of wartime?

While we fight our legislative battles in these Halls, while our own district interests operate to put us in one group or another at various times, let us remember that we are always engaged in another battle.

We are for better or for worse, in economic sickness and health, wedded to the executive and judicial. But each member in this three-sided marriage must be independent. When the legislative branch fails to exert its independence, it is the people who lose their voice in day-to-day government. The courts remain, but there is no remedy there such as that which the people have in Congress, with its great controls and grants of authority to set policy.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I, like millions of Americans, have been listening for many years over our news media, in the press and in statements made by Members of Congress, and people in political life, about a bipartisan foreign policy.

The phrase "bipartisan foreign policy" is one of the greatest misnomers that could possibly be used. Everyone knows our foreign policy is strictly and solely in the hands of the President under the Constitution of the United States.

The term "bipartisan foreign policy" implies in my mind, and I am sure it implies in the minds of many of our citizens, because of letters I have received and questions I have been asked, that the President of the United States when he is discussing the matter of a particular policy in our foreign affairs, would call in not only his own Cabinet members, not only the congressional leaders of his own party, but leaders of the opposition party. And this applies to previous administrations as well as this one.

Now, to my knowledge, the President just does not do this. I have written a report this week which I am going to read. I sent this to all of my weekly newspapers, because of recent letters I have received, in which I have been asked: Were the Republican Members of Congress a party to the foreign policy announced in respect to Cuba, in respect to Canada, in respect to the Skybolt, England, and with respect to our policy insofar as France is concerned?

My report reads as follows:

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY?

I receive many letters in which people ask: "What is meant by bipartisan foreign policy."

The Cuban fiasco again has pointed up the complete fallacy of what the Kennedy administration likes to put on a sanctimonious pedestal in the guise of "bipartisan foreign policy."

Believe me, there is no such thing.

Certainly, when the President of the United States, who has sole constitutional authority for our foreign policy, makes an irrevocable agreement, even though it may be dangerous, as he did with Castro, all Americans, regardless of politics, back him up.

But, that doesn't mean that his errors are the result of what some of the eggheads like to call bipartisan foreign policy.

What the President does is to make his decisions and then call in the responsible people of both parties and say, in effect: "Well, I've done this. Now, you must be good Americans and go along with me."

This may imply that the opposition sit back and say and do nothing. Well, as an American and as an elected Representative of the people, I never have and never will do that.

The Cuban mess is a good example. So are southeast Asia, Katanga, etc. The President set a policy; then he told us what he had done and expected us to say amen.

Finally, in October of last year, he did what I and others had recommended—he blockaded Cuba. It should have been done long before that, but anyway he finally did it. So, we pledged our full support to a measure which was overdue, but to which there was no alternative. In the pitifully inadequate measures which followed, we were told nothing—not even the real facts about the Russian buildup in Cuba.

What, then, would have been the result if some of us had swallowed the high-sounding philosophy of "bipartisan foreign policy" and said nothing.

The thousands of Russian troops which are still there would have gone unnoticed. Castro would have gone blithely along, uninterrupted to set up, with Russian help, the Communist base from which to infiltrate all of Latin America, which is his real aim, all the time prepared to protect himself against any U.S. interference because he had missiles which could devastate our cities and the Russian technicians who knew how to operate them.

This, in truth, would have completed the Communist lease of Cuba which President Kennedy all but signed when he pledged that the United States would not invade Cuba.

Certainly, there was no bipartisan approach to that noninvasion policy. The President simply did it and then told us so.

So, there is no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. There shouldn't be and I'll never be a party to any such arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, particularly those on the Republican side, who believe in a sound foreign policy, should be told what is going on, if our foreign policy is to be bipartisan in its preparation and in its actual conduct. I know that under the Constitution, both past and present, this has not been done. I am not asking that it be done. But, at least what we should understand and what our people should be told, is that these decisions are the decisions of the President. The President has full and complete responsibility.

But, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a statement was issued by the State Department pulling the props out from under the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, by insisting that nuclear warheads go into Canada.

Now, I understand that the President was furious about that statement when he was apprised of it in the press. Yet, I did not hear that anyone lost his job. I did not hear that Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who stated that he would accept the full responsibility for the statement, discharged anyone. I did not hear the President denounce anyone or deny the validity of the statement. Nor did I hear that anyone was discharged who was responsible for preparing or releasing the statement.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State had every means to find out who was responsible for it.

The decision was made at a meeting, or prior to a meeting down in Bermuda, between the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan. It was decided to stop the production of the Skybolt missile, a missile that England was preparing its bomber force to use. No one I know of who had Republican Party responsibility, was called in, prior to that decision, and I am not sure that anybody with Republican responsibility was called in after the decision or informed that the decision was being made.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of our country we should as Members of Congress advise our constituents just what this so-called bipartisan foreign policy means. I am not, at this moment, just talking about the present administration. The term seems to be used almost every day. Only last week I read in the press about 'Kennedy pledges leaders at secret session at the White House."

And down further in the article there is one very significant paragraph:

> There was some speculation at the session * * * was an effort by Mr. Kennedy to slam the door on any charges that his foreign policy was more partisan than bipartisan.

I am not in agreement with that paragraph because I do not charge the President and his foreign policy with being just a political foreign policy in that it is partisan politically. I merely say it is a fact that he makes the decisions. It is his responsibility and the decision is not bipartisan. There is no basis for the implication that Republican leadership as well as Democratic leadership of the Congress had agreed to that policy before the decision was made. This is the point I am trying to make. It is the point I am going to insist upon. It is the point I am going to constantly and continuously advise the people in my district about whenever and wherever I can get the information across.

Mr. Speaker, that is about the gist of what I have to say. I want that to get in the RECORD just the same as the statements I shall issue from time to time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word "bipartisan." My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word "bipartisan" as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

Mr. BECKER. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the *n*th degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

Mr. BECKER. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I think we should make the people understand why.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star, "Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News." I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand that the gentleman speaking to us at this time will include the article just mentioned as part of his remarks?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to include, after my remarks, the article by Arthur Krock which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, the title of which I have just read.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this? The gentleman has hit on the most salient point of my discussion and what I am trying to do. It is simply this: Our people, by a virtually controlled press, it would seem, or news media, on news and information not only from the White House but from our departments of Government, including the State Department and the Department of Defense, are no longer being apprised of the facts and the truth of what is happening throughout the world. If we are going to let this go by under the guise of what is called bipartisan foreign policy then I say that we are subject justly to the wrath of the people. We should be condemned not only as individual Members of Congress but as individual citizens because we are not living up to our responsibility and to the oath that we have taken on this floor in every session since we became Members.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to return for just a moment to the reference that was made to the article in the Washington Star of yesterday by Mr. Krock. I think first it should be made clear in the RECORD at this point that Mr. Krock himself states that he is a personal friend of the President and has been a personal friend of the family for many years. So certainly this very pointed criticism by Mr. Krock should not be viewed as a partisan comment. This was an observation of a highly respected and senior member of the Washington press corps. I think it should be pointed out in connection with this that apparently Mr. Krock's article drew some attention from the administration, because it is my understanding from an article in the Washington Post of Saturday morning that the administration now, under the direction of Mr. Sallinger, has proposed a "retreat" from spokesman for the administration and the press corps, so that either the press corps may better understand the administration, or else the administration may better understand the press corps.

I would hope however that whatever transpires at this retreat near Warrenton, Va., that representatives of the press will carry out the historic responsibility of that profession in America to defend their right to speak out and keep the public entirely informed.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I would hope the press would resume its responsibility from the publishers to the editors to the newsmen in publishing the news, in publishing and reporting as they always did the news and the facts as they see them, and not accept the brainwashing when they get down to this retreat.

Mr. AVERY. I think we ought to point out now that this controversy should not be confused with the Moss committee's 5-year project to guarantee the "right to know." As I understand the objective of the Moss committee, it is not the management of the news but relates to the Executive privilege of not making available to the press such information that is classified. The objection to making classified information available is entirely separate from the management or misrepresentation of the news as described by Mr. Krock.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. YOUNGER. In regard to Cuba, it seems to me as though we miss the point when we take so much time arguing about whether they have missiles or whether they have cannons or airplanes. It makes little difference whether they have those or whether they have slingshots. The Communists want a base of operations. Their technique and their method of operation is not military but is intrigue, infiltration, and sabotage. As long as any one Russian is there that danger exists. Is that not true?

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman that I do wish the American people had been better informed as to our objectives in imposing a blockade last year in Cuba, not merely to protect the security of the people of the United States from a missile attack but because this was a kickoff base not only to infiltrate subversively in all the countries of Latin America and South America but to help formulate guerrilla forces in those countries, to induce guerrilla operations and revolution in those countries from a Communist base in Cuba. This is what we tried to do all last year and are still trying to do, but we still cannot get the show on the road, so to speak.

I might refer the gentleman to an article by a great and knowledgeable lady, which appeared in U.S. News & World Report. The author I refer to is a distinguished former Member of the House, Clare Booth Luce. The article last week deals with this very effectively. I am inserting the article in its entirety in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman further realizes that a submarine base there is far more important than some of the missiles and other things?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, but we get into the area now of asking: Do we have proof the submarines are there? We do not have proof the submarines are not there. Do we have proof that missiles are there? We do not have proof missiles are not there. In other words, we have no proof. We tried to get it on the demand of the President last fall when he set up the blockade of Cuba. He should have stuck to his guns and insisted upon on-site inspection. If we were not strong enough to do it then, we ought to give up.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman, and congratulate him on his remarks and upon bringing this subject to the attention of the House.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has addressed the House on the subject of bipartisan foreign policy. I think the RECORD should show that the father of the bipartisan policy, Senator Vandenberg, made it very clear that he expected that foreign policy should be debated fully. I think his words actually were that it should be debated totally down to the water's edge. I think we should all remember that we do have a responsibility as a minority to discuss this subject fully but not to go out of our way to try to use any partisanship in our arguments.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution referring to the late Senator Vandenberg, because that was his position. I want to make this abundantly clear, that when the President made the decision on October 22 to blockade Cuba, we backed him up, but that does not mean we should roll over and play dead when he did not follow through.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. It would be a serious act on our part to sit here and do nothing. That is what I think the gentleman from New York was trying to bring out. Does the gentleman think there is any correlation between the timing of the announcement on the Cuban crisis, which happened just before the election, and the possibility this might have been done for a political reason or a party reason?

Mr. BECKER. Far be it from me to charge President Kennedy with politics. Actually, I think he is one of the most astute politicians on the American scene in many, many a year.

While I do not know the President's intent it was certainly in my mind at the time and it did have its political effect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD with my remarks an article concerning Arthur Krock in the Washington Star of yesterday and an article by Claire Boothe Luce, former Member of this House and a great lady and former Ambassador to Italy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN of Georgia). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HALL. With reference to the last point raised by our colleague about the timing and the political implication of the Cuban quarantine, or blockade, or whatever you want to call it, has the gentleman considered what a reversal of 2 weeks might have done to the November 1962 election—if instead of bringing out the Cuban situation 2 weeks before November 6 and the $7.8 billion deficit 2 weeks after, if those 2 items had been reversed? I wonder what the complexion of this House would have been today in such an event. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to those two alterations of simple facts and timing from the political point of view?

Mr. BECKER. Let me assure my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri who is very astute, that I am never averse to considering political consideration and statements made and the timing of them. Certainly, I will say with all the sincerity at my command that I believe the President of the United States waited until the most dangerous time in all history to order the blockade of Cuba on October 22. This should have been done months before—not when we knew all these missiles were in there—and launching pads were being built. And as to the great distortions of facts, the question is going to come up in the next couple of weeks as to the time when we knew these missiles were in there, when photographs were taken. I am sure some factual material will come out in the next couple of weeks. As to the other part of your question, the $7.8 billion deficit that was announced 2 weeks after election, I do not know whether in the minds of the people this would have had as much offsetting effect—I am talking about the political effect—as the Cuban blockade announced on October 22 because we all as American citizens were forced to make statements backing up the President's action at that time. We could not have done otherwise.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say I was among the first to back the President and say that the die had been cast and we should rally and not let partisanship interfere with us or go beyond our shoreline at that particular point. Of course, I expected we would finish the job when we "drew the mark," and had everything in our favor. But I think if history is to be objective and to describe where the error was made, it will not be on this question of elections of last year, but will go clear back to the Bay of Pigs, April 17, 1961. Finally, I would say it takes more than a bad cold in Chicago to make one change the course of history and come back from the campaign trail and invoke a quarantine. It takes the feeling of the American people, and I would hope that just as the gentleman in the well of the House, my esteemed colleague from New York, is today bringing up the question of the amorality of not debating foreign policy, be it good, bad or indifferent, so would history in its objectivity point out when you expect to have a $500 million excess in the budget as predicted in the state of the Union message and in the campaign message and in the 2d session of the 87th Congress budget message, then suddenly it turns into a $7.8 billion deficit, announced like this—afterward instead of before the election—it has its moral or lack of moral implication. I commend the gentleman on his exposé and his expertise today in the well of the House.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri. We sit on the same committee and I know how well he does on that committee. Let me point this out. You have brought out something which is most important, when the President—and this talk goes on all the time—about bipartisanship—particularly in this administration—I wonder what he called it during the campaign of 1960 and prior. Senator John F. Kennedy went from one end of this land to the other bemoaning a missile gap, day after day—one of the most dangerous things that any Member of this or any other body could do. He was telling our enemies that we were not prepared with missiles and that there was a great missile gap between what we had and what they had. And the then Senator John F. Kennedy was going from one end of the land to the other constantly harping about our loss of prestige and about how low our prestige was in the world.

Well, I say to President John F. Kennedy: If you felt that way about our prestige at the time of the election how do you feel about our prestige today? You do not have to take any poll to know how low our prestige is now. If that was bipartisanship, Mr. Speaker, then I am right in what I am saying about biparti-

sanship today and that is why I think more of our Republicans must make their voices heard so the American people will have no doubt as to the facts. I want to call these facts to the attention of the American people, for it is badly needed.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his cogent remarks on bipartisanship. During the course of the gentleman's remarks the question of "news management" suggested itself. I had prepared for delivery in the House today some remarks on news management. They include the article about Mr. Arthur Krock, the distinguished New York Times correspondent which has been referred to by the gentleman. Also an Associated Press article regarding the Cuban news situation reporting the views of my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. Finally, a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. I wonder if their relationship to news management would not be a little more effectively presented if the three articles were set out in the RECORD at one place?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman wishes to insert it following my remarks?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Yes; if it can be done at this time.

Mr. BECKER. I am about finished. I have no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do? Is he attempting to spread his remarks among those of the gentleman from New York, or afterward?

Mr. BECKER. After.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Star]

KROCK CALLS KENNEDY BOLD, CYNICAL ON NEWS

(By the Associated Press)

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says: "If Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, the principal onus rests in the printed and electronic press itself."

Mr. Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'information directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said that "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

HITS "SOCIAL FLATTERY"

Mr. Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by "social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators," and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office.

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Mr. Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem which, Mr. Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Mr. Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, the President said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news, if that is what we have been trying to do."

LONGTIME FRIEND

Mr. Krock has been a longtime friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In his Fortune article, Mr. Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

"1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been indorsed more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

"2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

OUTLINES KENNEDY METHODS

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press. Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West New Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. Charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to 'prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.' Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration."

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious.' (But nobody gets fired.)"

In conclusion, Mr. Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods * * * by which 'management of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public-relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator. Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers, and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

CUBA CRISIS AND NUCLEAR ARMS—WHY DE GAULLE GOES HIS OWN WAY

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

The President was asked in his press conference [on January 24] what he thought of the theory put forward in Europe that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was linked in General de Gaulle's mind with his determination to have his own nuclear deterrent force, because Cuba showed that the United States would not defend Europe.

The President replied that this charge had, indeed, been directly made, and he indicated that some Europeans had deduced from the fact that the naval blockade had ended with Moscow in unchallenged control of Cuba that, "since the Soviet developed their own nuclear capacity there is a balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and neither would use it, and, therefore, Europe cannot rely on the United States." This he called peculiar logic.

But, after Cuba, not only "some, in some parts of Europe," but also many in many parts of America, and in Latin America, no longer believe in the U.S. commitment to defend other countries from communism, if to do so should mean to initiate a nuclear war with Soviet Russia.

And, the President's remarks notwithstanding, there is much recent evidence that Mr. Khrushchev himself is now thoroughly convinced that, once the 400,000 American troops in Germany are withdrawn, America's nuclear commitment will then extend no farther than its own coastline.

If memory serves, after the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion Mr. Kennedy repeatedly warned Mr. Khrushchev that communism in this hemisphere was "not negotiable." Mr. Khrushchev, strongly suspecting that this warning was merely for U.S. domestic political consumption, boldly seized the opportunity to put it to the acid test: Fully aware that he would be detected in the end, he sneaked nuclear weapons into Cuba, and zeroed them in on the White House.

When the President found this out—quite a long while after Cuban intelligence sources had told him it was happening—his reaction was immediate. He called out the Navy, which called Mr. Khrushchev's brilliantly and carefully calculated bluff.

This was probably precisely what Mr. Khrushchev intended. Mr. Khrushchev had long been in the position of having to lose his face in order to save it. He wanted to lose his ugly nuclear "mug"—the face of the "nuclear aggressor." He was anxious to show the world that he was not the man to start a nuclear war against anybody over a third country, and he certainly wanted to have it made plain that Mr. Kennedy wasn't the man either. A solid basis for negotiations of all kinds—and popular fronts of all kinds—could be built on the foundations of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear-peace pact.

One can only imagine Mr. Khrushchev's satisfaction when his theory vis-à-vis the U.S. military position was proven correct. But he could hardly have been prepared for the next surprise. No sooner had he agreed to remove all the nuclear hardware U.S. air surveillance had spotted than Mr. Kennedy at once referred to him as a "great statesman" and, to show that there needn't be any hard feelings over the little episode, gave him Cuba.

Mr. Khrushchev did not naturally bother to return the President's compliment. He

realized, of course, that it had been made to gentle him—Mr. Khrushchev is as easy to gentle as a king cobra.

A few weeks later at the East Berlin World Communist Congress Mr. Khrushchev was bragging to the world that his missile play in Cuba had achieved its real objective—to scare Mr. Kennedy into giving up Cuba. After accepting the thunderous applause of the 2,500 Communist Party delegates present from 70 nations, Mr. Khrushchev vowed all over again to "bury us," this time with his 100-megaton bombs, but only if we were ever so rash as to initiate a nuclear attack on him.

Ever since Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev has worked hard on his new image. Each passing day he sounds more and more like John Foster Dulles: He will never launch missiles at the United States, or Europe, but he will—if attacked—produce "massive retaliation."

The fact is that Mr. Khrushchev had long ago opted for nuclear peace with the U.S.A. Since Cuba, he knows that the United States has also opted for nuclear peace with Soviet Russia. There is today an undeclared nuclear-peace pact between the U.S.S.R. and the United States for the simple reason that the initiation of nuclear war is not to the best interests of either.

The United States press, following the President's lead, is currently taking a benign view of Mr. Khrushchev's new nuclear posture. Besides, it feels so good since he stopped poking his Cuban missiles into our solar plexus. The vials of their wrath have been saved up for Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has had the gall to say, since Cuba, that he thinks France would now certainly be more safe under its own nuclear umbrella than under America's.

FRANCO-RUSSIAN DEAL? "PREPOSTEROUS"

Because of this, General de Gaulle's "image" is being rapidly worked over, with the enthusiastic help of the American left, to resemble a half-mad Napoleon, or an Abominable No-man. It is even being suggested that General de Gaulle wishes France to become a nuclear power in order to make a deal over Germany with Russia. This is to suggest that France desires to have Russia on her own borders, instead of Germany's, which is, of course, preposterous. If either France or Germany falls to the Reds, all Europe falls with them, and every European knows it.

It is interesting to inquire what General de Gaulle was doing the first tense hours of the United States naval blockade, while Soviet missiles were being leveled by Russian troops on American cities.

Was he threatening to pull out of the grand alliance if the United States invaded Cuba?

Was he begging us to throw the whole business into the U.N.?

Was he reminding us that the French feel that the United States let France down in Indochina, Algeria, and Suez, so France couldn't be expected to sympathize with our troubles about Cuba?

Was he advising President Kennedy to make a deal with Khrushchev about Cuba fast, because if the United States invaded Cuba Khrushchev might retaliate by striking at West Berlin and thus trigger world war III?

He was not. The general was offering to fight by the side of the United States if we felt our vital interests required us to kick Castro and Khrushchev both out of Cuba. And by this very fact he was pledging France to take all the nuclear risks we felt we might be incurring.

The President, in his recent press conference, acknowledged that General de Gaulle "responded when we were in difficulty in Cuba." "But" he added, with some extraordinary peculiar logic of his own, "I would hope that our confidence in him would be matched by his confidence in us."

This whole sentence must have been a typographical error.

The President had just admitted a period back that, when we were in difficulties, President de Gaulle had shown the ultimate in confidence by his willingness to risk nuclear war—if risk there was—by the side of America.

What the President really meant to say, of course, was that, whereas President de Gaulle had shown confidence in us at the time of the naval blockade, the final U.S. political capitulation to Khrushchev and Castro had diminished that confidence, and that the President hoped that somehow it could be restored.

The hope is an idle one. The fault is by no means entirely the President's. France has grown economically strong enough to stand on her own legs. It would follow naturally, in any case, that she should desire sooner or later to stand on her own legs militarily.

The significance of the two Kennedy backdowns over Cuba is that what was a desire now seems—or at least to General de Gaulle—to be an urgent necessity for France's own survival.

The character of the U.S. nuclear commitment made in 1946 changed in the 1950's when Russia became itself a nuclear power. Today, as in 1946, that commitment is to launch a nuclear attack on Soviet Russia if she moves against Germany.

But in 1963 the same commitment means a willingness to destroy the United States for the sake of Europe. When the matter is put in this blunt fashion, how many Americans are for it?

Khrushchev took the full measure of President Kennedy and U.S. public opinion in the Cuban crisis. So did Charles de Gaulle. His conclusion: If the war chips should ever go down in Europe, the United States will not initiate nuclear war on Russia until Russia wages nuclear war on America—and vice versa. The effect of this undeclared nuclear pact is to subtract both U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear forces from the European military equation.

Europe is today, without its own nuclear force, a limited war area. Consequently the outcome of any European conflict would then be decided by Russia's 125 divisions and NATO's 23—or a negotiation.

Militarily Europe is Germany and France. Their choice today is as plain as the nose on General de Gaulle's face. It is to get their own nuclear umbrella or to trust the United States, if they are attacked by Russian conventional weapons, to launch her missiles at Russia, knowing that she would get Russia's 100-ton megaton bombs right back.

General de Gaulle has made the only choice a patriotic Frenchman could possibly make. Like the rational Frenchman he is, he chooses to build up his own nuclear establishment.

He knows that the day U.S. troops are pulled out of Germany, France will be unable to defend itself without its own nuclear force.

In his youth, President Kennedy wrote a book called "Why England Slept." It described how England, in 1939, was caught militarily napping by the Germans, and its very sound thesis was that no nation can afford to wait until it is attacked to prepare its own defenses, and that, above all, it cannot rely on the military or economic strength even of its allies to save it from destruction.

IF UNITED STATES PULLS OUT OF EUROPE

Charles de Gaulle has paid the author of "Why England Slept" the compliment of taking his advice. He does not intend to be caught napping if at some future date the United States, in order to prevent a world holocaust—and its own destruction—yanks its nuclear umbrella away from Europe.

It is hard to see what is "Napoleonic" about a Frenchman's desire to protect France, or why the desire to remove France from the category of a limited war area should be considered a folie de grandeur. What is much more a folie de grandeur is the desire of the United States to keep Europe a United States nuclear colonial area and to keep Great Britain, France, and Germany forever in the United States nuclear nursery.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in my view bipartisanship in foreign affairs is wrong. Agreements may indeed occur between members of both parties inasmuch as Americans do indeed stand together as a Nation in a hostile world. The ties that bind Americans are far greater than the divisive forces at work in the world today that separate us from Socialist-Communist societies. Our Republic and our people, blessed with freedom are a world apart from Communists and those dictatorships that deny freedom and self-determination to their people.

But agreements that result in bipartisan harmony must never preclude, foreclose or in any way or to any degree limit freedom of speech. Most of all, in foreign affairs we must freely express our views. More heads are better than a few. Our free criticisms result in a final policy which Americans will support as we have many times. But these decisions and policies were amalgams of many and various views, sometimes highly critical. Our Republic's strength is in our differences and contrasts of views that result in thorough analysis. If now we must abandon our right to speak freely and criticize then indeed our constituents are voiceless, are not represented and we have a dictatorship—the very form of government we abhor the most. Let us not adopt the enemy's views in order to discredit and defeat him.

Indeed, our very lack of policy today—the so-called no-win policy, the bewildering conflicts of U.S. sovereignty and U.N. decisions, the countless forms of aid to the enemy that we give in many kinds of foreign aid, the suicidal acceptance of Monroe Doctrine violation, the supine refusal to stand up for U.S. sovereignty as we back down in concessions to countless demands by Communists—these and more partially demonstrate, I believe, our error in having adopted a posture of so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] said, the unilateral decisions of President Kennedy are not the policies and decisions of Republicans. The mistakes under this administration in foreign policy are not, therefore, Republican mistakes. Nor should mistakes—and there are now many—be whitewashed or buried from view by blocking criticism by accepting a policy of bipartisan agreement.

Indeed, on the contrary, the administration should right now be championing a foreign policy so firm, so clearly

understood by all, so protective of U.S. sovereignty, that it could withstand all Republican criticism—or if it cannot—then the valid criticisms of Republicans should be recognized, analyzed, and adopted.

It is at this point that this administration's lack of policy breaks down so clearly. The lack of overall policy and the fitful reacting without a basic policy to the various threats to freedom and peace as they arise in the world are now the reason, apparently, for the President calling for bipartisanship—so that the mistakes will be glossed over and the blame not cast on him. The President cannot escape this responsibility but more important—the countless mistakes of Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, France, Canada, and Latin America must be corrected. So it is that the President's only hope, as I see it, is to call on the Republicans—correct the continuing mistakes and protect our Nation and her people. Not dodge, delay, or sidestep the continuing errors that need correction now.

As a starting point let me suggest that we reimpose the Monroe Doctrine, clarify the Vietnam war where Americans are being killed in a war that is not a war, eliminate the foreign aid that goes to the enemy, the Communists, and stop supporting the United Nations aid to the enemy.

There are other solutions available to troublesome problems if the President would first not worry about covering up criticism by bipartisan appeals; second, contradict those in the administration who say it is proper for government to lie to her people; third, get about really protecting U.S. sovereignty instead of apologizing for U.S. determination to protect freedom, justice, and decency, and finally stop managing the news, preferring at last to confide in the people, telling them and us, their representatives, what world situations really are, so that we can all join in protecting ourselves and our beloved land.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, expanding means of communication have created a promise of better news coverage for Americans. From a technical viewpoint, we must applaud such achievements as Telstar.

However, in the age of Telstar, Mazors, and the like, a new phenomenon has arisen known as news management. Some aspects of news management are reminiscent of George Orwell's 1984.

My distinguished colleague from Maryland called attention to this phenomenon in a statement on the House floor February 21, 1963.

The reprint of the statement follows:

WASHINGTON "CON" MEN

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is ignoring a confidence game being played in Washington and so we must warn the public about it. The object of the game is to use the people's money to bamboozle them on a national scale. The scheme is simple. An administration tipster calls a political favorite who has played no prior part and breaks the news of the award of a Government contract in his State. The favorite then calls the news media at home and releases the glad tidings with at least the implication that he is making a personal benefaction to his constitutents.

Honest citizens who are familiar with complex Government procurement procedures are not impressed. Reporters, editors, and newscasters are not fooled by this hocus-pocus. Let us hope that they will expose it for the deception that it is.

On Sunday, February 24, 1963, the Washington Post and Times Herald printed the views of the distinguished columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, concerning news management. It says:

KROCK CHARGES CYNICAL NEWS MANAGEMENT, DISTORTION TO KENNEDY

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says, if Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, "the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'informational directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said the "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns, such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators, and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office.

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which, Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, Mr. Kennedy said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news if that is what we have been trying to do."

When the questioner, correspondent May Craig, remarked that she doesn't believe in managed news at all and thinks "we ought to get everything we want," the President brought a laugh by replying: "Well, I think that you should, too, Miss Craig; I am for that."

Krock, 76, first covered the National Capital during the administration of William Howard Taft. As chief of the Times Washington bureau, 1932–53, he won two Pulitzer Prizes and a citation equivalent to third.

He has been a long-time friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In writing that quotable exclusive interviews with the President no longer are rare, as they formerly were, Krock recalls the protests that arose from the Washington press corps when President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave one in 1937, and President Harry S. Truman gave another in 1950. Both interviews were obtained by Krock.

Asked whether he believes those Presidents did wrong in giving the interview and whether he feels that he should not have participated in them, Krock said:

"Not at all. It served their (the Presidents') purpose and they were doing me no favor."

He said the two Presidents felt that "the best and most effective medium" of publicizing what they had to say was the New York Times.

In his Fortune article, Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been enforced more cynically and boldly then by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press.

"Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.

"Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower Administration.

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious' (but nobody gets fired)."

In conclusion, Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods * * * by which 'managements of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator.

"Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

On the same page of the Washington Post and Times Herald, there appeared a story entitled "Representative PELLY Says State Misled Congress, Press."

The statement is herewith inserted in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE PELLY SAYS STATE MISLED CONGRESS, PRESS

A Republican Member of Congress charged the State Department yesterday with deliberately misleading Members of Congress and the press last fall on the Cuban situation.

Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington, registered his complaint in a letter to Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton.

Last September 25, PELLY said, the State Department informed Members of Congress that there was no evidence of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet-bloc country. On the same day he received his summary, PELLY said, Assistant Secretary of Defense William Bundy was telling a House Military Appropriations Subcommittee in secret session that missile sites of an offensive nature were being constructed in Cuba.

"I believe the facts regarding the offensive military buildup in Cuba were in the possession of the Department of State when you issued the summary stating there was no evidence of Cuban offensive capabilities, including offensive ground-to-ground missiles under Soviet direction or guidance," PELLY said in his letter to Dutton.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the State of Wyoming became the 36th State of the Union to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Thereupon, three-fourths of the several States had acted favorably in pursuance of a joint resolution of the Congress to authorize a Federal income tax. The U.S. Senate had passed this resolution on July 5, 1909, and by a vote of 318 to 4, the House had passed it a week later.

Mr. Speaker, little did the Members of Congress of that day realize the extent to which their action would change Government and the Federal system. Little did Cordell Hull and other supporters of this tax realize its ultimate effect. Actually, it was believed the tax would never exceed 2 percent.

Today, Mr. Speaker, our House Committee on Ways and Means is holding hearings on proposed reduction and reform of the income tax, and for me, as for my colleagues and the taxpayers we represent, it is a time for us to decide as to what is best in the way of lowering and improving the tax structure.

In this connection, I have been reading the proceedings of the 61st Congress, 1st session, and have reviewed the debate on the resolution to amend the Constitution, which was Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Actually, the issue was not one of taxing incomes of individuals equally, but rather to overcome a U.S. Supreme Court decision which held that under the then language of the Constitution, Congress was not authorized to levy a tax on corporations, because that would not be apportioning the taxes equally as between States.

Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment, according to its advocates, was to be a war power that could be vital to the existence of the country. But it was not to be a peacetime tax.

I want to read today to the House in commemoration—if that is a proper term—and in any event in sadness, certain excerpts from the House debate on Senate Joint Resolution 40, but I point out first, Mr. Speaker, that this was a tax measure which originated in the Senate, contrary to the Constitution. Most of our fiscal problems, in my opinion, have originated in the other body. If only the House had originally been given sole and exclusive power by the Constitution over taxes and expenditures, there would be no national debt of any consequence today, nor any need for such a burdensome system of taxation, requiring at the moment admittedly much in the way of reduction and reform.

However, Mr. Speaker, then as now, there were some wise heads in the House. Listen to what Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, said on July 12, 1909. Compare the vision and views of this erstwhile Member of the House with the opinions and political foresight of some of Massachusetts' sons and political leaders of today.

Here are Mr. McCall's words as to equal taxation and representation in regard to the proposed change in the system of taxation:

In the Constitutional Convention, States having only one-third of the population of the country were in a majority; but today States having only one-sixth of the population elect a majority of the Senate, and yet it is proposed to throw away incontinently this important safeguard of the Constitution, this great democratic feature, and the Democratic Party proposes to take a hand and throw the rule of apportionment to the winds. I submit that if you are going to give up the rule of apportionment, you should confer upon the representatives of the people some compensating power to take the place of the safeguard you take away. You should at least provide that the House and the Senate should not amend them; that its power should be confined either to vetoing or accepting them—the power which the House of Lords in Great Britain has in reference to all tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, again let me quote Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts. His arguments made against the income tax amendment are interesting:

So, Mr. Speaker, while they say that they desire this power for time of war, we see today in time of peace the attempt to exercise the power to its utmost extent. And why not, then, limit it expressly to time of war? Why not, for the just protection and the equal rights of the people of New York and of the other great States of this Union, five of which probably will pay nine-tenths of an income tax, although they will have only one-ninth of the representation in the Senate—why not preserve the limitation upon the power of the Central Government? Why drag every governmental power to Washington so that a vast centralized government may devour the States and the liberty of the individual as well? I say this amendment should be more carefully considered than it has yet been considered.

It is liable to go into the Constitution of the United States and be forever a part of the organic law in the form of which it has been. I may almost say, extemporized or improvised. The character of the argument which has been made, that this tax is for use in time of war, leads me to observe that the chief purpose of the tax is not financial, but social. It is not primarily to raise money for the State, but to regulate the citizen and to regenerate the moral nature of man. The individual citizen will be called on to lay bare the innermost recesses of his soul in affidavits, and with the aid of the Federal inspector, who will supervise his books and papers and business secrets, he may be made to be good, according to the notions of virtue at the moment prevailing in Washington. And, incidentally, since every business secret in the country can be had access to by the authorities at Washington, the citizen may be made to see his political duty if you happened to have a President who confused the attainment of his ambition with the highest good of the universe and was willing to abuse his power in order to coerce the citizen. You are creating here an ideal condition for corruption and for the political Jack Cade of the future to levy blackmail.

A statement by a Member from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, is worth reading. In his remarks, he said:

I am a firm believer that in times of peace the revenues of this country should be derived from customs duties and internal-revenue taxes, and that if these are not sufficient, as prudent people we ought to reduce our expenses to a point where they will be covered by such revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read also from the remarks of Representative Harrison, of New York. He favored the bill, but listen to this wishful bit of thinking. Mr. Harrison said:

If the resolution prevails, it should be incumbent on the conferees upon the tariff to drop immediately from consideration the proposed corporation tax put into the bill by the Senate. This resolution now before the House provides for the taxing of incomes from whatever source derived. That means taxes upon incomes of corporations as well as individuals. In my opinion the corporation tax as it passed the Senate is unconstitutional; but if this resolution prevails, and the States give us the constitutional right to pass a law taxing the incomes of corporations as well as individuals, such doubts will be at once removed. Moreover, as it now stands, alone, without an individual income tax, the corporation tax is the most grossly unfair impost ever levied by motion of either Chamber of Congress. It is unfair because it will allow one man with a $100,000 income to go free, while another man who may get $10,000 in income must pay the tax because his business is incorporated. It allows the man conducting a grocery business upon one corner of the street to go scotfree, while another man that carries on the same business on the next corner of the same street is obliged to pay a tax because he has incorporated his business. It thus violates the fundamental principle of taxation, namely, that its burdens should be equally distributed.

Mr. Harrison's remarks bring to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that an inequitable and heavy burden of taxes such as constitutes the income tax today was one of

the major objectives of the Communist Manifesto. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote their guidebook to communism in 1848, and one of their key points was to tax the middle class into submission. In his directive to the proletariat, Marx flatly said a heavy progressive or graduated income tax was essential to destroy capitalism

Mr. Speaker, frankly, it must be recognized that under the cold war conditions and continuing world crises, the Treasury of the United States needs revenue. However, when we hear the advocating of tax cuts without any spending curtailment in order to increase the employment and stimulate business, I keep thinking of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Would not all this massive spending with no tax revenues to provide for it delight those two masters of mischief?

On this 50th anniversary of the income tax, let me show the progress in the direction urged by those two men. Here is a tabulation of per capita Federal tax receipts showing the changes in tax rates in selected fiscal years from 1789–1962. This table is from "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," published by Tax Foundation, Inc. It indicates the trend toward Marxism:

Per capita Federal tax receipts

Year	Per capita
1789–91	$1.12
1800	1.92
1810	1.22
1820	1.61
1830	1.75
1840	.81
1850	1.75
1860	1.73
1870	9.72
1880	6.31
1890	6.03
1900	7.07
1910	6.89
1920	54.81
1930	29.78
1940	43.56
1941	59.28
1942	101.16
1943	168.54
1944	314.63
1945	334.04
1946	308.53
1947	285.71
1948	295.72
1949	278.60
1950	268.32
1951	342.22
1952	431.67
1953	454.60
1954	447.78
1955	415.15
1956	461.64
1957	484.30
1958	474.93
1959	466.69
1960	527.17
1961	530.97
1962	550.64

In discussing the results of the income tax, I think mention especially should be made as to its effect on Government. On this subject, let me quote from an address of Alfred J. Schweppe before the North Carolina State bar on October 26, 1962. Listen to this:

Actually the first big step in the direction of unlimited Federal power was the 16th amendment adopted in 1913 authorizing Congress to levy, without limit, a tax on incomes from whatever source derived. Those persons who at the time strongly objected to this unlimited taxing power were soothed with the pious declaration that it was inconceivable that the tax on incomes would ever go over 2 percent. Congress passed the first Income Tax Act in 1916. Within 2 years during World War I it went up to 85 percent on the highest incomes, and is today, and for many years last past, has been in the same general area. So far as the 16th amendment is concerned, it permits a 100-percent confiscation of all incomes and the reduction of the American people to the status of recipients of Government doles.

The 16th amendment authorizing an income tax without limit was, in the judgment of many, a great mistake. But all efforts to impose a limitation belatedly have proved and will probably continue to prove abortive, because governments do not give up powers, particularly taxing powers, once deferred; rather they stretch the powers they already have.

Mr. Speaker, I think the caliber of the present members of the House Committee on Ways and Means is very high. The comments I receive from my constituents on the President's tax proposal are far from favorable. I hope and I believe the House Committee on Ways and Means will not report out such a bad bill as has been proposed. Rather, my fear is that Congress may not reduce Federal expenditures sufficiently to justify any tax cut.

It seems to me the very desirable objective of stimulating business and increased prosperity can only come through a combination of reducing both taxes and Government spending. I would favor about $5 billion cut in each.

If, however, this Nation really wanted to improve employment and step up the economy, the corporation tax is the place to do it.

When, Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, the deterrent to business and industrial expansion and growth by killing profit incentive began. I suggest that if the current movement to repeal the 16th amendment should prevail, the machinery of business in this country would start to hum and employment would increase as never before in the lifetime of any of us.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, a substantial cut in the corporation tax, with a reduction in nonessential Federal Government spending will help a great deal.

Yesterday the Washington Post printed an article, "Stifled Cheers Will Hail Income Tax 50th Year," by Harry Gabbett.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article as a rather fitting conclusion to my comments:

STIFLED CHEERS WILL HAIL INCOME TAX 50TH YEAR

The Internal Revenue Service marks a big milestone Monday—and if the printer should make that "millstone" he won't be changing the meaning very much.

On February 25, just 50 years ago, the State of Wyoming became the 36th to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution.

That was the income tax amendment and by its authority last year the Internal Revenue Service collected almost $100 billion from you, yew, and y'all. The rousing success of last year's drive has inspired IRS to conduct it again this year and it takes no seer to suggest that this will be another banner year.

IRS concedes that it will be entirely fitting that this year's milking should outproduce all others. It will impart that much more significance to the golden anniversary of the process.

It is probably no accident that nobody is known as the "father of the income tax." The idea had long smoldered in a variety of legislative breasts, but Abraham Lincoln was the first President to use it on anything like a grand scale. He considered it the only way the Civil War ever would get paid for, and when that crisis eased, the income tax was allowed to expire without much fanfare in 1872.

During the next several years the Government was able to keep its financial head above water with the proceeds from excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco and customs duties from tariffs. But advocates of the income tax still believed it the more equitable means of meeting the country's growing financial obligations.

Congress finally took a shot at it in 1894, enacting an income tax as part of a tariff law passed during Grover Cleveland's administration.

Levied was a flat 2-percent tax on individual incomes in excess of $4,000 and on corporate incomes in excess of $5,000, but the Supreme Court held in 1895 that the tax was illegal and it never was collected.

The landmark decision held that an income tax was a direct tax and as such could be levied only by apportionment among the States on a basis of population.

In 1907, however, President Theodore Roosevelt observed publicly that "most great civilized countries have an income tax and an inheritance tax. In my judgment, both should be a part of Federal taxation."

Two years later supporters of the tax launched a congressional drive to have the 1894 law reenacted and President William H. Taft called for the constitutional amendment which would get around the Supreme Court's apportionment objections.

Taft's suggestions were incorporated into the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909—a piece of legislation which served mightily to cloud paternity of the income tax as it operates today.

Alabama ratified the proposed amendment the same year and with Wyoming's "yes" 3 years later the United States was in most everybody's business.

Corporations were taxed 1 percent on net incomes in excess of $5,000 and the Supreme Court in 1911 called it an excise tax on the privilege of doing business. Individuals were allowed a $3,000 exemption—$4,000, if married—and there was a graduated surtax on incomes over $20,000. At those prices, less than 1 percent of the population was affected, however, and it wasn't until World War II that everybody began to feel the bite.

In 1939 only 4 million individuals paid an income tax, but in 1945, 43 million out of 50 million filed returns were taxable. About 62 million personal income tax returns were filed last year.

Progressive rates of taxation, a key feature of the 1913 legislation, have been retained through the years, making the income tax—in the words of an early champion of the tax, Senator Joseph W. Bailey, Democrat, of Texas, the only tax ever devised that "rose or fell with a man's ability to pay it." Current individual tax rates, changed but little from World War II, range from 20 to 91 percent.

By 1965, IRS expects to be coping with the annual flood of income tax paperwork completely on a pushbutton basis. High-speed computers, electronic memory systems, and magnetic tape will be calling the painful shots each spring and IRS offices are abuzz with not-so-incredible rumors of wonders to come.

High school teachers are pretty much in agreement that the 16th amendment to the

Constitution presents a consistent stumbling block for pupils who somehow are able to identify the rest of them with little or no trouble.

They are also pretty much in agreement that there is no accounting for this blind spot, especially in view of the fact that no other amendment to the Constitution has done more for or to so many citizens of this country in the 50 years since Wyoming put it on the books.

LEGISLATION TO REGULATE SALE OF SECURITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SPRINGER. 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. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes.

The District of Columbia has, for a considerable time, needed such legislation. Questionable practices by a small minority of dealers in securities has made this legislation necessary.

May I say that by and large the great majority of the stock securities dealers in the District of Columbia have been honest and above reproach. However, the number of complaints that have come to the members of the District of Columbia Committee in the past few years has been considerable. Let it be to the credit of the National Association of Credit Dealers that they have filed complaints in many cases in an attempt to give some kind of self-enforcement and intergrity to the responsible securities dealers in the District. In 1960, this association filed complaints against 25 percent of the District members. This is considerably above the national average of only 8 percent. This gives some idea of the necessity of adequate legislation to govern the industry in the District. In view of this large percentage of complaints filed by the National Association, it certainly behooves the District of Columbia to take some action which is legally enforceable and will protect the investors within the District of Columbia.

Almost all of the States of the Union have "blue sky" laws. It is unfortunate that the District of Columbia itself has not had this legislation in the recent past. The lack of this legislation has made it possible for many unscrupulous dealers in securities to operate within the District. Many investors in the small, medium, and large fields have been bilked by these unscrupulous people.

There ought to be legislation on the books which will make regulation possible and correct this unfortunate situation. The Commissions of the District of Columbia have submitted a draft bill and that is the one that I have introduced today.

I think as a result of hearings on this bill we could bring out more fully the situation as it has existed in the District in the past few years. Through those hearings, I am sure we can bring forward some kind of legislation that will be helpful and will protect the investing public in the District of Columbia. This is the purpose of the legislation.

WALTER KRAWIEC, EDITORIAL CARTOONIST, CHICAGO'S MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening Walter Krawiec, editorial cartoonist for the Chicago Polish Daily News was honored by that newspaper and the people of Chicago and Illinois as the Man of the Year for 1962.

In an elaborate banquet in the grand ballroom of the Sherman House in Chicago, Mr. Krawiec was presented the annual Veritas et Caritas Medal by the Polish Daily News for his 50 years of work as an editorial cartoonist for this fine newspaper.

Mayor Richard J. Daley, speaking for the people of Chicago, and Gov. Otto Kerner, speaking for the people of Illinois, by personally appearing at this magnificent tribute, in their own messages described the depth of gratitude and respect which all of the people in our community hold for Walter Krawiec.

He indeed exemplifies the spirit of truth and charity.

In receiving this highly coveted award, Mr. Krawiec joins the ranks of former famous Men of the Year selected by the Polish Daily News who include President John F. Kennedy and Mayor Richard J. Daley.

It is fitting that Walter Krawiec, an editorial cartoonist, should be selected as the Man of the Year. During the span of five decades this man, through his unique grasp and understanding of world events, has been able to bring to the people of Chicago a quick understanding, in his daily editorial cartoons, of those complexities in our society which authors of books and papers frequently require volumes to describe.

The editorial cartoon has played a singularly important role in civilization's efforts to better understand the complex nature of our society. Walter Krawiec exemplifies the very essence of his noble profession. Even though he is an accomplished artist in his own right and is recognized as one of the great illustrators of the modern circus, he has earned world renown for his oil portraits.

Walter Krawiec has won numerous awards as a frequent exhibitor at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C.; the National Academy in New York; the Chicago Art Institute, and museums throughout the country.

I prefer, however, to honor him as a chronicler of world events. Soft spoken by nature, he is transformed at the easel into a veritable crusader; pen and ink, brush and paint become weapons which he wields forcefully and courageously against evil in the world. The downtrodden and oppressed find in him a champion, while the evildoers feel the full force of his struggle for truth and justice.

Walter Krawiec is a deeply religious man and he employs his art for the noble enrichment of life. He does not permit man or society to be disillusioned, substituting purely material progress for Christian perfection. Yet as a great poet or musician would, Walter Krawiec has the unique capacity to settle into artistic serenity when there is no need for a crusade; when critical times pass, painting, and drawing with warmth and understanding the persons and places of everyday living.

In the five decades that he has served as editorial cartoonist for the Polish Daily News, Mr. Krawiec has recorded the most spectacular half-century in the development of our Nation.

We Americans are that much richer for having the panorama of American and world progress recorded for posterity by men such as Walter Krawiec. We as a Nation are that much wiser and better equipped to understand the great challenges of a complex world because men like Walter Krawiec are able to reduce this complexity through the use of a few bold strokes of the pen to an understanding which even those with a very limited education can grasp.

His editorial cartoons in my very humble judgment have helped translate the very essence of democracy to the people of the Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the brief but meaningful remarks delivered by Mr. Krawiec in accepting this award will describe this ingenious man better than anything I might say. In his brief acceptance speech, Mr. Krawiec demonstrates at once a lifetime of fruitful contributions to society and a humility which has made his work a testament to his life.

His speech can serve as an example to students of speech because its depth of thought is nurtured in a concept of brevity. Mr. Walter Krawiec's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF WALTER KRAWIEC IN ACCEPTING VERITAS ET CARITAS AWARD IN CHICAGO FEBRUARY 23, 1963

Mr. Toastmaster, Father Provincial, very reverence and reverend Fathers, distinguished guests and friends, there was a time more than half a century ago that the seed of this eventful day was sown. It was a day in which my career took a formal step at the suggestion of some firemen, who watched me sketch some horses on rough cardboard at the firehouse.

These good men urged me to go to the Art Institute where I could develop a talent they thought I had. Maybe because I saw them jump to action so often that I too that afternoon followed their advice promptly.

Somewhat antecedent to today's "hike" craze, I walked from Chicago and Milwaukee Avenues and up to the art institute. Up to this moment, I was all determination, all courage. But standing barefooted in what seemed a different world, I experienced that frightful feeling that I didn't belong. It was long, but a friendly hand touched my shoulder. You know something—that

same frightful feeling is back again here, at a speaker's rostrum.

For the man who by habit has expressed himself through pictures all of his life, I find this spotlight too bright. Yet, the aura of this spot is somewhat dispelled by the realization that I am surrounded by friends. You must be true friends to give me an evening like this.

If I had my easel at hand, I would sketch a cartoon something like. I would picture myself in a little world of my own, standing with my mouth wide open in amazement as people of great stature and noble hearts came to me as if from another planet and they brought with them the friendly handshake, good wishes, honors and appreciation, and as they passed, I would murmur, "Thank you for your kindness."

Yes, thank you to the Resurrection Fathers and their great newspaper for this signal honor of the Man of the Year, and thank you, friends, for this warm gathering.

I have no regrets this evening, only a humble satisfaction that I have tried to use whatever talents God gave me to add, however small the contribution, to a better world. In my 50 years with the Dziennik Chicagoski, I have been a privileged spectator in watching the world change from a horse and buggy existence into a space age of rockets.

I spoke in pictures to each generation as best I knew how; particularly did I speak to my own ethnic group as it slowly transformed from a small band of immigrants into a powerful group, loving their fatherland, but putting their shoulders to the plow of the great American way, until they have emerged into dutiful sons and daughters of America.

In this growth of our people, I remember sad moments as my editorial cartoons went on page 1—sharp, critical, and at times denouncing—because a sin is not to be covered but exposed and eradicated. But then what a pleasure it was to present persons and groups as they progressed to goodness and greatness.

On my board I saw the rise of the great fraternal and charitable organizations, the magnificent churches and schools, the men in politics and other services. To all these, I spoke and I say the privilege was mine.

So this evening as I accept the Truth and Charity Award, grateful to all of you who made this possible, I cannot forget the great men and women who give substance to my work. Thank you all very much.

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. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BELL), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26.

Mr. WEAVER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26, 1963.

Mr. PELLY, for 1 hour, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $270.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. ALGER.

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

Mr. DINGELL.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

At large

George Grant.
George W. Andrews.
Kenneth A. Roberts.
Albert Rains.
Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
Carl Elliott.
Robert E. Jones, Jr.
George Huddleston, Jr.

ALASKA

At large

Ralph J. Rivers.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Morris K. Udall.
3. George F. Senner, Jr.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.

CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen.
2. Harold T. Johnson.
3. John E. Moss.
4. Robert L. Leggett.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. William S. Mailliard.
7. Jeffery Cohelan.
8. George P. Miller.
9. Don W. Edwards.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. J. Arthur Younger.
12. Burt L. Talcott.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
15. John J. McFall.
16. B. F. Sisk.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Harlan Hagen.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Augustus F. Hawkins.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Ronald Brooks Cameron.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Everett G. Burkhalter.
28. Alphonzo Bell.
29. George E. Brown, Jr.
30. Edward R. Roybal.
31. Charles H. Wilson.
32. Craig Hosmer.
33. Harry R. Sheppard.
34. Richard T. Hanna.
35. James B. Utt.
36. Bob Wilson.
37. Lionel Van Deerlin.
38. Patrick Minor Martin.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. Donald G. Brotzman.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Emilio Q. Daddario.
2. William L. St. Onge.
3. Robert N. Giaimo.
4. Abner W. Sibal.
5. John S. Monagan.

At large

Bernard F. Grabowski.

DELAWARE

At large

Harris B. McDowell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. Robert L. F. Sikes.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Claude Pepper.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.
9. Don Fuqua.
10. Sam Gibbons.
11. Edward J. Gurney.
12. William C. Cramer.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.

4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. Charles L. Weltner.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. John W. Davis.
8. J. Russell Tuten.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII

At large

Thomas P. Gill.
Spark M. Matsunaga.

IDAHO

1. Compton I. White.
2. Ralph R. Harding.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. William T. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. Roland V. Libonati.
8. Dan Rostenkowski.
9. Edward R. Finnegan.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Robert McClory.
13. Donald Rumsfeld.
14. Elmer J. Hoffman.
15. Charlotte T. Reid.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Robert T. McLoskey.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Kenneth J. Gray.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. John Brademas.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. J. Edward Roush.
6. Richard L. Roudebush.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Donald Cogley Bruce.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. James E. Bromwell.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.
5. Neal Smith.
6. Charles B. Hoeven.
7. Ben F. Jensen.

KANSAS

1. Robert Dole.
2. William H. Avery.
3. Robert F. Ellsworth.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. Joe Skubitz.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. M. G. (Gene) Snyder.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Eugene Siler.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. Gillis W. Long.

MAINE

1. Stanley R. Tupper.
2. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Rogers C. B. Morton.
2. Clarence D. Long.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

At large

Carlton R. Sickles.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Torbert H. Macdonald.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
9. John W. McCormack.
10. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.
11. James A. Burke.
12. Hastings Keith.

MICHIGAN

1. Lucien N. Nedzi.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Edward Hutchinson.
5. Gerald R. Ford.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. James G. O'Hara.
8. James Harvey.
9. Robert P. Griffin.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Harold M. Ryan.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.

At large

Neil Staebler.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Clark MacGregor.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Donald M. Fraser.
6. Alec G. Olson.
7. Odin Langen.
8. John A. Blatnik.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. John Bell Williams.
4. Arthur Winstead.
5. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. Wm. J. Randall.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard H. Ichord.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.

MONTANA

1. Arnold Olsen.
2. James F. Battin.

NEBRASKA

1. Ralph F. Beermann.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Louis C. Wyman.
2. James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

1. William T. Cahill.
2. Milton W. Glenn.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Florence P. Dwyer.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Charles S. Joelson.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Joseph G. Minish.
12. George M. Wallhauser.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.
15. Edward J. Patten.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Joseph M. Montoya.
Thomas G. Morris.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. James R. Grover, Jr.
3. Steven B. Derounian.
4. John W. Wydler.
5. Frank J. Becker.
6. Seymour Halpern.
7. Joseph P. Addabbo.
8. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
9. James J. Delaney.
10. Emanuel Celler.
11. Eugene J. Keogh.
12. Edna F. Kelly.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. Hugh L. Carey.
16. John M. Murphy.
17. John V. Lindsay.
18. Adam C. Powell.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. William Fitts Ryan.
21. James C. Healey.
22. Jacob H. Gilbert.
23. Charles A. Buckley.
24. Paul A. Fino.
25. Robert R. Barry.
26. Ogden R. Reid.
27. Katharine St. George.
28. J. Ernest Wharton.
29. Leo W. O'Brien.
30. Carleton J. King.
31. Clarence E. Kilburn.
32. Alexander Pirnie.
33. Howard W. Robison.
34. R. Walter Riehlman.
35. Samuel S. Stratton.
36. Frank J. Horton.
37. Harold C. Ostertag.
38. Charles E. Goodell.
39. John R. Pillion.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Ralph J. Scott.
6. Horace R. Kornegay.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. Charles Raper Jonas.
9. James T. Broyhill.
10. Basil L. Whitener.
11. Roy A. Taylor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Hjalmar C. Nygaard.
2. Don L. Short.

OHIO

1. Carl W. Rich.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Homer E. Abele.
11. Oliver P. Bolton.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Robert T. Secrest.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.

At large

Robert Taft, Jr.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Victor Wickersham.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. Robert B. Duncan.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Robert N. C. Nix.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Herman Toll.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. George M. Rhodes.
7. William H. Milliken.
8. Willard S. Curtin.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph M. McDade.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. J. Irving Whalley.
13. Richard S. Schweiker.
14. William S. Moorhead.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. John C. Kunkel.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. Robert J. Corbett.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. Elmer J. Holland.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. James D. Weaver.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Albert W. Watson.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Robert W. Hemphill.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Ben Reifel.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. James H. (Jimmy) Quillen.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. W. E. (Bill) Brock.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. Richard Fulton.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Robert A. Everett.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Ray Roberts.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Graham Purcell.
14. John Young.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. Ed Foreman.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Henry B. Gonzalez.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.

At large

Joe R. Pool.

UTAH

1. Laurence J. Burton.
2. Sherman P. Lloyd.

VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. John O. Marsh, Jr.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Catherine May.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.
7. K. W. (Bill) Stinson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. John M. Slack, Jr.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. Elizabeth Kee.

WISCONSIN

1. Henry C. Shadeberg.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

William Henry Harrison.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

459. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 64th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Peoria, Ill., September 9 to 13, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. 73); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

460. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

461. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

463. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for fiscal year 1962, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1963 Report of the Office of Coal Research, on coal research activities, pursuant to Public Law 86–599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

465. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first annual report of the lead and zinc mining stabilization program for the year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 347 of the 87th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill permitting the

Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

467. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

468. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report relating to the providing of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1962, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

469. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report from the Office of Emergency Planning relating to positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, which has been received since transmitting our annual report under a letter dated January 29, 1963, pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

470. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove restrictions on charges for forms, copies, and certifications"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4147. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4148. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4149. A bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4150. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4151. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4152. A bill to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (relating to compensation of Members of Congress) to provide for a method of incentive pay increases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 4154. 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.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4156. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4157. A bill to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4158. A bill to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Personnel", codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and its civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4159. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefit payable thereunder to $75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4163. A bill making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duty treatment of certain bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4167. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide that cigarettes sold in interstate commerce shall be packaged and marked so as to show the nicotine content and the tar content of the cigarettes in each package; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4169. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services for aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4170. 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. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions, service on the Mexican border before World War I may be included in determining whether a veteran meets the service requirements applicable to the payment of pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4172. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4173. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4174. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1964, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to clinical thermometers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 4178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes in order to extend the right of selection granted therein to the States to unsurveyed unappropriated public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the status of air freight forwarders as air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for the certification of air freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4183. A bill to declare a policy as to the existence of public domain in Wisconsin in lands erroneously meandered and lying between the original meander line and the lakeshore, and to protect the rights of landowners whose title to water-fronting property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4184. 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.

H.R. 4185. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4186. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246; 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4188. A bill to assist in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4190. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4193. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 4194. 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. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4195. A bill relating to the reclassification and sale of certain desert land on which entries have been made; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4196. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that upon request made by a State or political subdivision thereof, surplus real property will not be disposed of until such State or political subdivision has had not less than 2 years to perfect a plan of use for such property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of soluble and instant coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4199. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4200. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 4201. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4202. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 4203. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4204. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4205. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4206. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYMAN (by request):

H.R. 4207. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J.Res. 278. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 263. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of public hearings of committees of the House under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota to give immediate attention and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to directing the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the requested congressional hearings in the affected State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being opposed to all legislation similar to H.R. 7640 of the 87th Congress, relating to imposing further Federal controls in the field of unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting approval of appropriation for the planning and developing of Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States relative to presenting the automation of outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation to reduce Federal taxes with tax reforms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United

States relative to requesting congressional action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4208. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Leandro Pastor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wielkosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4211. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Surender Lal Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Stephen Lee (also known as Lee Fung Yew and Lee Shiu Keong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Barbara Bukowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Takeshi Morozaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

51. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Margaret M. Kaaua, county clerk, Hilo, Hawaii, requesting Congress to authorize further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington's Birthday Address by Senator Stennis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Virginia Chapter, Sons of the Revolution, all members of which are descendants of officers in the Army of George Washington, celebrated the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country last Friday evening in Richmond, and the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was the guest speaker. I was privileged to introduce Senator STENNIS and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my introduction and the brilliant speech he made on that occasion.

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

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSISSIPPI, BY SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, AT DINNER MEETING OF SONS OF REVOLUTION, RICHMOND, VA., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

Nearly 16 years ago, JOHN STENNIS promised the people of Mississippi that if they elected him to the U.S. Senate, he would "plow a straight furrow right down to the end of the row."

As we all know, Mississippians elected this former State legislator, district attorney, and circuit judge, in 1947 to represent that State in the Senate and we have all benefited because he has kept his plow deep and his furrow straight.

In the Senate, he has compiled a record of diligent, dedicated, and devoted public service, and has honored the seat which Jefferson Davis occupied, when he was a Senator from Mississippi.

Your speaker tonight is a ranking member of the Armed Services, Appropriations, and the Space Committees of the Senate. Two years ago, he was given the key assignment as chairman of the powerful Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the "watchdog" committee that oversees our national defense program. At the present time, he is conducting hearings on the conflicting reports about the buildup of Soviet military forces in Cuba to determine the true facts about that threat to our national security. He is the most qualified man I know for that vital assignment.

While the name STENNIS is synonymous with national defense and military preparedness, he is also an authority on constitutional law. He serves as permanent captain of one of the three southern teams organized in the Senate to lead the fight to protect the sovereign rights of the States and to preserve southern traditions and constitutional government. Last year, he played a key role in the defeat in the Senate, after weeks of debate, of vicious legislation to abolish the literacy test established by Mississippi and 20 other States as one of the qualifications for voting. An encroachment on the rights of the States to determine these qualifications. Only a few weeks ago, he was one of those leading our successful battle to preserve rule 22 and the right to engage in extended debate in the Senate, thus assuring our right to be heard and to protect our people against vicious and ill-advised legislation. He was one of three authors of the southern manifesto, and this declaration of constitutional principles, signed by more than 100 Members of the Congress, remains unchallenged as the most forceful statement of the position of the South.

He has been frequently mentioned as a future Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Former President Eisenhower named him as one of three Democrats qualified to serve as President of the United States.

JOHN STENNIS is esteemed and respected by his Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats.

And I am proud to say that Virginia had a major role in the career of JOHN STENNIS, for it was in our State that he obtained his legal education and spent 3 key years of his life. Anyone elected to membership in the University of Virginia chapter of Phi Beta Kappa has earned that honor. Senator STENNIS is truly Virginia's third Senator.

It is with gratitude and pride that I present to you a truly great American, a distinguished statesman, U.S. Senator JOHN STENNIS.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi)

It is a special pleasure for me to be with you tonight in celebration of the 231st anniversary of the birth of Gen. George Washington.

The tributes paid to George Washington are legion. Perhaps the best known is that expressed by Gen. Henry Lee when he characterized his beloved fellow Virginian as "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Having spent some fond years at the university at Charlottesville, I developed a great admiration for the wisdom of the Sage of Monticello. The keen insight of Thomas Jefferson into men and governments has helped shape the destiny of this country. It was he who fought to preserve the integrity of the States in our Union—and would that there were more modern-day Jeffersons to help regain that measure of respect for the sovereignty of the States that he struggled so hard to establish in the founding days of this Republic.

And it was Thomas Jefferson, who, to my way of thinking, paid the highest tribute of all to his friend, George Washington. Jefferson said:

"His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives or interest or consanguinity, or friendship or hatred, being able to bias his decision."

This observation indicates the sensitive regard of Washington to the public trust implicit in the office of the President. He abhorred any possible violation of this trust by the suggestion of interest or bias in the administration of this office. This fine example set by our first President should be closely followed by Chief Executives of our time and future times.

Jefferson continued:

"He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man. * * * On the whole his character was, in its mass, perfect * * * in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

Certainly it is most fitting and proper that we meet together tonight to consider this great man of history. He is indeed a man of history, for he, like all history,

teaches great lessons to succeeding generations.

I want to speak to you tonight about Washington as a symbol—a symbol of liberty—and a symbol of the fundamentals of our democratic way of life. When we speak of Washington as a symbol, however, we must never lose sight of his very human qualities. He was no god—but a humble servant of humanity and the country which he helped to establish. He was no military genius, though he was one of the ablest field commanders and army administrators in all history. He was no intellectual, but a man of simple, yet methodical judgment.

As a symbol of liberty, Washington is best seen as the commander in chief of the Continental Army. Through his inspired leadership of this ill-equipped, ill-trained, but magnificently motivated Army, he wrenched from the most powerful military force of that day the victory which gave us our liberty.

When I think of Washington as the leader of the Revolutionary Army, I see in my mind's eye two great paintings. The one showing General Washington at the bow of a boat on a bleak night, his jaw firmly set and a determined gaze fixed upon the objective, crossing the Delaware River. A picture portraying with all of the artist's power the determination and courage of this great leader. And then I see the magnificent study in compassion, showing Washington at Valley Forge. These two paintings show us the full measure of George Washington as a military commander.

All of the greatness of this man cannot be seen on the battlefield, however, or even on the great field of honor at Yorktown. His service to his country did not end with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. To my mind, it had just begun.

As commander in chief of the Continental Army, he held the balance of power in this emerging Nation. His success in gaining victory firmly fixed him in the minds and hearts of his countrymen. With a discontented army still in arms and with no real government in existence, Washington was the only source of authority and law that had anything more than a local influence. There was the matter of the long overdue pay for the Army and the adjustments to peaceful ways, both fermenting unrest among the men in arms. Early in 1783, petitions were circulated by the officers denouncing the constituted authorities and expressing the impatience of the young officers for their just rewards. As the feelings reached the fever pitch, General Washington appeared before his assembled officers and received their petitions. He took from his uniform a letter just received from a Member of Congress explaining the delays of the young Government and its good faith. He started to read the letter, but faltered. He paused, reached into his pocket, took out his new spectacles, and put them on. "Gentlemen," he said, "you must pardon me for I have grown gray in your service and now find myself growing blind." How petty must the problems of that group seemed by comparison. This simple observation quelled what might have been a mutiny within the Continental Army against the newly formed Government.

Repeatedly, Washington was suggested as the head of a monarchy to be established in the place of a republican government. Col. Lewis Nicola, leading a group of the staff officers of the Continental Army, proposed this idea to their commander in chief. When he heard this, he expressed pain that such an idea existed among his colleagues. He said:

"I am much at a loss to conceive what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to an address which to me seems big with the greatest mischief that can befall my country. * * * Let me conjure you, if you have any regard for your country, concern for yourself or posterity, or respect for me, to banish these thoughts from your mind."

Isn't it ironic that the man who became our first President could have become a king? There is a real lesson in humility in this—one which all his successors to this high office might well ponder. The greatness in a man is best seen when he refuses to assume power which would be detrimental to the best interests of those he serves.

As he shrank in distress from the idea of ruling his fellows as a monarch, so did Washington recoil from acceptance of lesser emolument pressed upon him by grateful contemporaries. A good example is a gift to him by his native State of Virginia in gratitude for his services to the State and the Nation. The gift was 100 shares of James River Co. stock. Washington donated this canal company stock to Liberty Hall Academy in the heart of the valley of Virginia, which thereupon bestowed upon him the title of "Patron of the arts and literature." This donation is significant in showing his attitude toward education and significant in the history of the small school which eventually became Washington and Lee University. This donation was the first large gift of securities to a college in the United States. It sustained the college through some of its most difficult years, and it inspired other gifts to this and other schools.

The university still derives annual financial support from George Washington's gift, which, in 1928, was merged with the university's general endowment and reinvested, and now yields over $2,000 per year.

Washington and Lee University's historian, Dr. Ollinger Crenshaw, writes of Washington's gift:

"Perhaps the gift of George Washington to Liberty Hall Academy in 1796 was exceeded in importance to the school's development only by the appointment of Gen. R. E. Lee to its presidency in 1865. Not only did the income from President Washington's donation come as a godsend to an institution which had desperately striven to maintain itself, but the academy's future became interwoven with the name of the father of his country."

We in the United States have a rich heritage in the institutions of our Government, beginning with the Declaration of Independence * * * an indictment against a despotic monarchy, but yet we see in this document the aspirations of a people determined to govern themselves. This will of the people for self-government is manifested in that greatest of all charters of freedom, our Constitution, which established the framework of a form of government unparalleled in the long history of mankind.

The stamp and thread of Washington can be seen in these two great instruments of freedom. Indeed, it was Washington who presided over the Convention in Philadelphia which gave us the Constitution. He used his great influence to bring about its ratification, writing many letters and even engaging in debate with the opponents of ratification. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe made this sharp appraisal of the role Washington played in the ratification of the Constitution:

"Be assured [General Washington's] influence carried this Government."

In my opinion, Washington never rose to greater heights than he did in certain remarks at the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

The suggestion was that as an adequate part would be rejected anyway, that an extreme makeshift proposal should be quickly adopted.

He said: "Too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

History's brightest pages record no achievements more illustrious than those of the Founding Fathers of our Nation, and none more calculated to instill pride and patriotism. How often do we turn for inspiration to the men of those troubled Revolutionary times, replete with example after example of rarest courage. They wrote and proclaimed the Declaration of Independence with no army and pitiable resources. Indeed, when they fired the first shot at Lexington, they had no army. And after victory at Yorktown, and for a good number of years thereafter, they had no effective government. Yet with foresight and fortitude they wrote the Constitution of the United States, founded on high principle but adopted with doubt and apprehension that its noble purposes might never be achieved. Thus, a feeble nation of free people embarked on its uncertain course, but on the way to growth and development beyond their highest dreams and beyond precedent.

What made the difference? What was it that set the ship of state off on its magnificent voyage to greatness and achievements unmatched in all history? Many fearless and determined patriots contributed, but we are mindful that it was the leadership and great spirit of George Washington that made the difference.

Having fought to gain freedom from the oppression of George III and nurtured the establishment of a republican government through the Constitution, it was only natural that Washington should counsel Congress upon leaving the Office of President. His farewell address is not only a stirring valedictory of our first President, but it carries many profound truths in it which are applicable even today.

In its contemporary setting, the address was made at a time when our Nation was still in the stage of its early development. Each of the Thirteen Colonies had been a political entity. They had joined together in a common cause * * * the war for their independence. Under the Articles of Confederation, the separate status of each State was preserved and they delegated only certain areas within which Congress could act for their collective good. There had to be a great deal of blending and compromise to weld these 13 sovereignties into a union. It required all of the statesmanship imaginable to accomplish this feat. We are indeed fortunate that destiny provided that statesman in the person of our first President.

But now the Father of our Country was relinquishing the helm of the ship of state.

What was the counsel of this great American?

First, he set the pattern by clearly stating the bedrock principle of our Government. "The basis of our political system," he said, "is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government." He had led many men into the supreme sacrifice that Americans might be the arbiters of their political institutions. He did not lightly regard the role of the individual citizen, through his freely elected representatives, to determine the course that his country should take.

Washington strongly advised his people as follows:

"Toward the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to

effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthown."

Heeding this advice of George Washington, Senator ROBERTSON and I, together with many of our colleagues in the Senate, have recently fought to preserve the tradition of debate in the Senate. This rule was invoked to assure protection for minorities in this country; but those who would impose cloture to this body say that it stifles not only the President's program, but legislation sought in behalf of minority groups. Is this not a specious pretext for an innovation which George Washington sagely counseled against?

He further speaks of caution in making changes with this admonition:

"In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion."

How do you think the hypothetical economic theories concocted in the Harvard traditions of Messrs. Heller and Schlesinger would fare in the light of Washington's admonition here? If there has ever been a more graphic illustration of the very thing which Washington cautions us against it is the theoretical approach of these two intellectuals to solving our country's economic dilemma. Somehow I feel that the American public will be intelligent enough to see through the fiscal mania which has been proposed for our consideration at this session. Your distinguished Senator and my good friend, HARRY BYRD, has not been taken in by this scheme. And I am proud to say that there are many of our colleagues who also will act to resist this unproven and highly dangerous change in the fiscal affairs of the country.

Washington emphasized the vital importance of the defined powers of government and pointed to the departmentalization of powers in our own constitutional government. He said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another."

Chief Justice Warren would have been better advised to give due regard to these pointed words from our first President, rather than the opinion of the Swedish sociologist, Gunder Myrdal, in his leading of the Supreme Court in its unprecedented legislative decision in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. Even Chief Justice Marshall with his rather liberal view would have reeled at the usurpation of the prerogative of Congress in the school desegregation decision.

Thus, George Washington counseled an infant nation—a nation which he helped to establish, a nation which he led as its first President for two terms. He was a man of true greatness. His first thought was always of his duty to his country. This principle motivated him to become the great commander in chief of the Continental Army—to reluctantly assume the Office of President and to decline a third term in this high office. His greatness lay in his selfless adherence to that which he knew to be right.

Let us apply some of these principles to the Cuban situation. We all know that this is one of the more critical and crucial problems of our time.

We all welcomed the announcement that the Soviets would withdraw several thousand troops from Cuba. This is only as a limited step in the right direction. Neither this withdrawal nor any other partial withdrawal should be considered as a final solution of the basic Cuban problem and threat.

The basic problem, and the real threat to the Americas, lies in the fact that international communism now has a firm foothold in the Western Hemisphere. The "Made in Moscow" government is in Cuba for the primary purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America. We know that it is here to stay—if we permit it to do so.

Public debate during the past few weeks has focused largely on whether Khrushchev has or has not withdrawn his offensive weapons from Cuba. Certainly, this is important. None of us can afford to be unconcerned about the threat of missiles and planes which can rain nuclear death and destruction on us in a matter of minutes. However, we must not allow our attention to be preoccupied entirely by an overly meticulous concern about whether the military threat to us has been increased or decreased fractionally by the introduction or withdrawal of certain types or numbers of weapons. If we do we may very well fail to face up to the proposition that, regardless of how many or how few troops support it, the alien and antidemocratic government now being maintained in Cuba by Russian armed soldiers is in and of itself the real and basic threat to the peace and security of the American Republics. International communism at our very doorstep, without regard to the supporting weaponry, is offensive to me, and, I believe, to a majority of my fellow Americans.

I am not primarily concerned over the exact number of troops Khrushchev has in Cuba. Even ten would be too many. I believe that it is the fact that the Russian Bear now stands astride the unhappy island of Cuba which most troubles the average American. The American people are disturbed and uneasy because they know that we cannot live with this menace indefinitely.

Therefore, they want to be assured that our responsible officials recognize the problem and recognize also that it will not just disappear with the passage of time. They want to be convinced that we have the national will and purpose to do everything within our power to wipe out all Soviet-dominated governments in this hemisphere and that we have a firm and hard plan and policy to accomplish this.

In short, I believe that our people take the same position which the Congress itself took when it adopted Senate Joint Resolution 230 last October 3. In adopting this resolution we in Congress expressly reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine and declared that we were "determined to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere." The resolution declared we were "determined to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of any externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States."

The American people ask only, I believe, that we adhere to this resolution and that we demonstrate once again that the historic Monroe Doctrine is still an integral part of our national policy and that we do, in fact, consider any attempt by foreign powers "to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security."

When these things are done—and when our people are convinced that our Nation is still strong, resolute, vigorous, determined, and above all, unafraid—I know that the patriotic people of this Nation will unite four square behind the Government as they have always done in times of national crisis.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, in the real course of its inquiry, will develop all of the facts and I hope that it can make a real and tangible contribution in shaping a hard and firm policy which will finally rid the Americas of this cancerous communistic growth.

This is no time for despair. Fear has no place in our thinking. We have every reason to face the future with faith in our form of government and in our ability to make it work. Endowed as we are with individual liberty and our national resources, with faith in a Higher Power and a determination to do our part, we shall meet and conquer the problems of our time. May God sustain us as we go.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 23, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

TIMID AND FEARFUL LEADERSHIP COSTING U.S. PRESTIGE

The week's news is frightening to every American citizen concerned with the future of the United States. More and more the American people are becoming deeply concerned with the timidity and almost childish fear of the President to make decisions. The result is that the prestige of the United States has never been lower. Our allies are losing confidence in us because they are not sure they can depend on us. Some results of the President's confused policies, or rather lack of policy: (1) De Gaulle's insistence on Europe going it alone without depending on the United States; (2) the collapse of the Diefenbaker government in Canada and a rise in anti-American feeling which is jeopardizing our entire defense perimeter in the north; (3) increased unrest in Latin America with more bold action by Communists openly swearing allegiance to Castro and the Soviet Union; (4) the hesitancy of Italy and Spain to renew our bases or to permit the establishment of bases for Polaris submarines; (5) a tougher attitude by Khrushchev and renewed arrogance on the part of the Soviet Union in the nuclear test ban treaty talks and in its cynical offer to remove several thousand Russian troops from Cuba sometime.

The President's cautious reaction to the Mig attack on an American boat is not what this world so badly needs. A strong policy statement, dealing from strength, that we will protect American lives, property, freedom, and way of life from any and all encroachments—that any attack on us will result in instant and deadly retaliation. Such a position is our only hope to stop aborning the "war by miscalculation"—some other nation miscalculating the American people by

thinking the weak posture of our President represents the people. I say we are not weak, not afraid, nor cautious, nor watchfully waiting when it comes to our way of life. We know we are right, and will brook no opposition. "Give me liberty or give me death," is not an old-fashioned homily, but a present, vibrant truth. So it is that we can reasonably question our future conduct when our own leadership confuses and bewilders us. Think how uncertain other nations must be as they see us successfully attacked; as we fail to make any attempt to follow up the shot across the bow of a ship that disregards us; when we let a dictator who threatens to bring us ruin keep a military and subversive bastion in our hemisphere; see him get a promise from our leader of no attack; and watch him work to subvert other Latin and South American countries, some of which will fall in future months if we do nothing now. So we see the Keynesian socialism continue its course toward full subjugation of our economy at home and communism continue to advance abroad.

The failure of President Kennedy to act is increasing the danger to the United States. At a time when bold, brave leadership is needed, our country finds itself headed by a party machine whose energies are being spent in political maneuvering, reckless domestic experiments, and complete refusal to enunciate a foreign policy to protect our country and preserve freedom. The one ray of hope is that the people, from my observation across the country, are far ahead of the administration and it may be that public opinion will force the administration into a role of national leadership in spite of itself. In the meantime, it is up to Congress to do all possible to strengthen the country and preserve our free institutions.

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR INCREASE IN DEBT CEILING

Here we go again. As expected and as I predicted last year, President Kennedy is now calling upon Congress for a further increase in the debt ceiling. So long as Federal spending is uncurtailed, there will be no limit to the debt ceiling as America continues on its reckless course toward fiscal collapse and national suicide. The temporary increase in the public debt limit, as enacted during the last Congress, and which I opposed, provides as follows: (1) $308 billion to March 31, 1963; (2) $305 billion April 1 to June 24, 1963; (3) $300 billion June 25 to June 30, 1963. The administration has requested that the ceiling of $308 billion be extended to June 30, 1963. Otherwise, the administration will be confronted with a decrease of $9 billion in the debt ceiling on April 1 and another decrease of $5 billion on June 24. In effect, an extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond April 1, 1963, is the equivalent of a $311 billion ceiling on an annual basis. An extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond June 25, 1963, is the equivalent of a $316 billion ceiling on an annual basis. Hearings on the President's request will begin before my Committee on Ways and Means next Wednesday, February 28. This is just another example of the failure of the Kennedy administration to face fiscal facts. I warned last year when I voted against increasing the debt ceiling that we would be called upon to push it higher unless the President made some effort to cut spending. We know now, too, that another debt increase will be requested by J.F.K. later this year. Instead, he has presented us with the biggest peacetime budget in history, $98.8 billion. His refusal to even attempt to practice some discipline in spending the peoples' money can only result in bigger deficits, continued pressure for an expanding public debt, and the inevitable climax, national bankruptcy.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN CONTRADICTORY AND SELF-DEFEATING

In hearings this week before the Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax scheme, one of the Nation's top tax experts confirmed my charge that the Kennedy plan is contradictory and self-defeating. Dan Throop Smith, tax expert of the Eisenhower administration, denounced the Kennedy tax proposals as a "bitter disappointment." He said, "by concentrating the bulk of tax cuts in the lower brackets to increase disposable income, the program has adopted the most expensive and the least effective way of stimulating expansion." Mr. Smith also condemned President Kennedy's plans for increasing the Federal deficit. "The proposal for a net $10.3 billion cut in revenues on top of a prospective current deficit of $9 billion is a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being," Smith said, bearing out my prediction that if we follow President Kennedy's fiscal policies we will devalue our currency. Smith concluded his testimony with this damaging statement in pointing up the complete fallacy of President Kennedy's tax proposals: "The most serious error in the entire program is that when the parts are put together they contradict the standard of fairness stated by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time nullify much of the economic benefit which might be achieved."

In my opinion the President's tax proposals could be likened to a doctor who prescribes the wrong prescription (his unworkable tax proposals) after making a wrong diagnosis (that the American economy needs more government). In a bland statement the President then says, "those who oppose the program must take the responsibility for any deterioration in the economy which might come about over the next months." In other words, the doctor, having prescribed the wrong prescription for the wrong illness, now says that if the patient dies it will be because he refused to take the medicine. What is really needed for economic growth is less government, less spending, and tax cuts in stable dollars.

JUNKETING MEMBER'S ACTIVITIES NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF CONGRESS

Under the protocol procedures of Congress, Members of one body are not supposed to criticize those of the other body. Indeed, Members of the House are not supposed to note by name another member or to question his integrity or honesty. However, Members of Congress have a responsibility to the people to maintain the integrity of the Congress of the United States. Under the Constitution, Congress is the sole judge of the conduct of its membership. It is our duty to call attention to known indiscretions so that unethical practices are stopped by the House or Senate, or the people be given the facts so that they may properly discipline a Senator or Representative who abuses the power of his office. In recent weeks, the newspapers have reported the activities of one Member of the House and attention has been called to some of his practices by a Member of the Senate. He is now attempting to discredit all Congressmen by his own indiscretions. Fortunately, he is the exception, not the rule—nor can there be any excuse or justification for misuse of public funds by Members of Congress. The vast majority of the Members of Congress are extremely conscientious in doing their work and in discharging their responsibilities as representatives of the people. To charge them all with irresponsible action and mishandling of the people's money is to seriously impair the image of Congress and of the American people because a Congressman usually represents the people who elect him, and fortunately, for our system of government, Congress and the people are morally strong, honest, and dedicated. The danger in the twin policies of a weak administration which refuses to stand up to international gangsters, and in downgrading the image of Congress by unworthy deeds, is that it encourages the lawless and criminal element within our country. Hoodlums, seeing the success of Khrushchev and Castro and being given the impression that disregard of honesty and integrity is the rule in Congress, are made bold in defiance of our conventions and laws. Strict adherence by Congress and the people to our moral codes of ethics is the only hope this free Nation will survive these times of peril.

Local Communities and the States Must Meet School Needs To Avoid Federal Education Octopus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy put 24 separate proposals dealing with everything from elementary to graduate school Federal aid to education into one big omnibus request. The President thus issued an open invitation to the Congress, with his message giving the program a label of high priority, for an immediate creation of a new bureaucratic octopus to cost during the first 3 years a total of $4.6 billion.

Since the President's Federal aid to education request was received by the Congress I have tried to point out in my own State that we must adequately support our schools on the local and State level or the Federal Government will take over the function of financing education with the inevitable creation of a bureaucratic octopus similar to the powerful and ever-growing Agriculture Department that regiments our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission to do so, I include at this point the text of a letter dated February 21, 1963, to members of the Washington State Legislature urging adequate local and State support of schools to avoid having them under the control of a Federal agency:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1963.

To the Members of the Washington State Legislature, Olympia, Wash.

DEAR FRIENDS: The purpose of this letter is twofold; first, to express my keen appreciation for the courtesies afforded me when in Olympia recently, and second, to expand and point up more specifically the views that I offered in addressing the senate and house of the State legislature on that occasion.

As to the first point, it was certainly gratifying to observe firsthand the conscientious, objective, and responsible way in which members of the State legislature are

fulfilling their responsibilities. Certainly, Washington State's public interest should have priority over partisan advantage in the conduct of political duties.

Now, as to the second point—you will recall that my remarks to the legislature took notice of Federal preemption of major sources of money and the upset in National-State equilibrium which the Supreme Court of the United States vested in the States such as our State of Washington, when, contrary to earlier interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, in 1937 in a series of decisions, the Federal Government obtained unlimited power to tax and spend for the general welfare. Thereby, we created a grey area of responsibility with subsequent Federal legislation requiring matching funds, which often added to our State's financial difficulty in meeting normal public service needs.

In other words, often the Federal Government, by intervening in such important areas as education, has increased rather than provided relief for your difficulty.

You may recall my saying to the Washington State Legislature, in all frankness, that in my view government is best which is closest to the people. I spoke for retaining on the State and community level the control and management of our schools.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is the best example of what happens when a Federal agency takes over local and State problems. In 1933 the Federal Government began a new program of assisting our farmers. The resultant Federal control and regimentation is generally understood. To maintain the Federal Government octopus of bureaucracy in fiscal 1964, the administration has said it will need 121,583 Government employees and the cost to the taxpayers of the agricultural program is estimated as $8.4 billion. This is nearly five times the amount required to operate the Department of Agriculture 10 years ago and 49 times the amount when the farm program began.

Meanwhile, the number of farmers has been diminishing and, as I say, the program indicates what might happen if the Federal Government under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, takes over the major responsibility for public education.

Certainly, as I said, State financing problems will increase if local communities fail to vote special school levies when, from time to time, there are crises due to population growth and special local education needs. In turn, then, if the States fail to provide regularly through adequate budgetary appropriations for schools, then the pressure for the Federal Government to take over this responsibility will increase, and thereby the danger of centralized Federal control over the schooling of American children is increased.

People laugh when some of us suggest that we could have a situation here in America such as with Adolph Hitler in Germany through thought control over young people. But rather than recite history or speculate over the future, it is easier to point up the present, such as with the Federal agricultural program.

However, I never fail to point out the importance of local communities meeting their school needs, as with the 9.8-mill school levy decision that the voters of Seattle face on Tuesday, March 12.

As for the State legislature, I have not studied the current budget, but I would be hopeful that enabling legislation to expand the community college program is being considered favorably.

I know the Legislative Interim Committee on Education in its 1962 report recommended "that the numerical limitations on community colleges be eliminated" and bills to accomplish this have been introduced. Frankly, this strikes me as extremely important. In the First Congressional District, in the Shoreline School District, there are plans for such a project and I believe the necessary financial measures for it were voted a year ago. So, please count me as being in strong support of removing the limit on the number of such colleges which can be established.

Reverting again to the general subject of education, let me emphasize again my belief that if the citizens reject extra tax burdens when and wherever local school boards find it necessary to go to the people for additional funds, there will inevitably evolve more pressure for more money at higher levels of government. Furthermore, as you know, in such event, and wherever the Federal Government is called upon to expend funds, it must, under a Supreme Court decision, look to the way that such expenditures are made. In other words, if the parents of our schoolchildren, through their local school boards, desire to preserve their power of decision over the education of their children, and not turn the management over to a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.—similar to the farm program—then the local community, and of course the State, also, must support their schools adequately.

Again, expressing appreciation for your courtesy in allowing me to address the House and Senate of the Washington State Legislature to outline my understanding of our community of interests between our respective legislatures, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed another milestone in the history of the Soviet Russian colonial empire. Yesterday marked the 15th anniversary of the takeover of Czechoslovakia by the Communists. They remain in control today, backed as always by Russian troops.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America continues to keep alive the spirit of Czech freedom for Americans with their heritage in Czechoslovakia and others throughout the free world who share their concern over the plight of the people in Czechoslovakia.

The council has called attention to the tragic situation in which unreasonably heavy duties are placed on packages sent from America to Czech people. For example, the council reports that there is a duty of 50 crowns—approximately $7—on a kilo of used clothing, about 2.2 pounds. This duty of 50 crowns is in a society where the average office worker receives 6 crowns an hour and farmworkers as little as 12 crowns a day.

The council asks why American authorities allow this blackmail to continue, for it is a pure and simple device to secure American dollars for use in international trade.

Indeed, many in this country wonder about the present policies toward all the captive nations in the Soviet colonial empire. What is behind the reluctance and even opposition to congressional resolutions to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations? What is behind the weak proclamations during Captive Nations Week? Why are we afraid to assert ourselves in our position as leader of the free world?

Many of us in the Congress hope that the executive branch will move ahead in this field. It is the executive that is charged with foreign policy, but it becomes increasingly apparent that foreign policy toward the captive nations question is being handled with no more ability than our foreign relations with Canada, Portugal, Britain, and other old friends.

On this occasion, when we mark the Czech people's 15th year under Communist rule, we all hope that future U.S. actions will inspire the Czech people and the peoples of all the captive nations to continue their opposition to Russian communism. We hope they can find in our foreign policies some ray of hope and encouragement for their cause. We hope they will continue to find reason to believe that this Nation—now and in the future—believes that the people of each country on the earth should be allowed free and open elections and determination of their own destiny.

Hospital Care for Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would authorize hospital care for Gold Star Mothers at Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is my feeling that it is our Government's obligation to care for those who have suffered in battle, and also for their dependents and survivors which they have left behind.

These brave mothers raised sons and daughters to be good citizens and to give their lives, if necessary, to defend this great country of ours. We ought to do more for them than to pay honor and tribute on special holidays.

Many of these Gold Star Mothers are in need. My bill in permitting them to avail themselves of such medical care would not jeopardize the availability of facilities for the furnishing of hospital care to veterans.

The 45th Anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my insertion of remarks, I am pleased to include for the information of the House a very timely and informative speech delivered by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania at a commemoration of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. His talk was delivered in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1963:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the consular corps, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor and a great pleasure for me to be with you today, and I must begin by thanking you most sincerely for the kind invitation which brought me here. Several times in the past few years I had wanted to visit Lithuanians and their friends on the west coast, and finally I have the great happiness of being with you as we commemorate the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

For just a moment, I would like to share with you the thoughts that strike me as a first-time visitor to Los Angeles. One of the things that affects my imagination most deeply is the vast energy and dedication whereby the American frontier was extended from the east coast, where I have lived for some years now, to this City of Angels on the shores of the Pacific Ocean. The thought of a pioneer toiling bravely to reach the Rocky Mountains, the Sierra Nevadas, the desert, pausing in a lonely clearing uninhabited by men—all this thrills the imagination. This kind of initiative and self-possession, however, is familiar to me and to you in a different way, because these traits of boldness and courage are part of the story of Lithuania; and it is that story which has gathered us here today.

The American pioneer, as has often been pointed out, pursued a dream on the western horizon with an almost relentless passion. Even before the gold rush years, the eminent French visitor, Alexis de Tocqueville, was amazed by the speed with which this westward migration was taking place, and he said:

"It would be difficult to describe the avidity with which the American rushes forward to secure this immense booty that fortune offers. * * * He is unimpressed by the silence of the woods; the approach of beasts of prey does not disturb him, for he is goaded onwards by a passion stronger than the love of life. Before him lies a boundless continent, and he urges onward as if time pressed and he was afraid of finding no room for his exertions."

One of the principal characteristics of this relentless drive westward is particularly important, and many authors have commented on it at length. Briefly, it seems that the American pioneer, alone in the silence and challenge of the frontier, could easily imagine that he was leaving the east entirely behind him, and that a literally new world lay ahead. His ancestors, who had originally reached the eastern United States from their native Europe, had never ventured as far as this pioneer, and he could well imagine that he no longer had any ties left with the Europe whence his ancestors sprang. He was, he could assume, a new man, the so-called American Adam who no longer had a historical past or a geographical origin. There was only the future, and the far horizon to conquer; everything lay ahead.

This was, no doubt, a splendid dream, and it brought vast numbers of settlers to the shores of the Pacific. The boundless continent of which De Tocqueville had spoken was finally circumscribed. But the content of that dream of historical and geographical detachment, if I may twist a few Shakespearean words, was "such stuff as dreams are made on," and that dream soon vanished "into thin air." Already when I was a little boy in Pennsylvania shortly after the turn of the century, the children of the American pioneers were learning that they could not entirely divorce themselves from European events. And even though, for several years following the First World War, America could still attempt to avoid the "foreign entanglements" against which George Washington had warned, the outcome was inevitable. One of the most graphic illustrations of that outcome is the fact that the United Nations was formed on this very west coast of the United States, a west coast which was once thought by its settlers to be at the farthest possible removed from Europe.

The world has grown even smaller in the years since the Second World War. Anyone who lives on this west coast today knows that, farther to the west, there lie Korea, Vietnam, Laos, China, India—and the list could be expanded. There is not an area of the world west of Los Angeles that does not bear directly upon the happiness of every inhabitant of Los Angeles. And if we look back far to the east, whence came the ancestors of the men who settled this west coast, we see a Europe confronted with a new and ever more terrible enemy, with Berlin as one focal point of that conflict. If we try to see what lies in the future, inevitably we focus on the menace of imperialistic world communism, which threatens that very pursuit of happiness within a free society which led to the establishment of this great city of Los Angeles. And those of us in this room today can add one further dimension of experience to that glance eastward and westward: if we look to the east, we see our homeland of Lithuania, cruelly subjugated for over 20 years by the ruthless tyrants of the Kremlin; if we look to the west, we see Siberia, land of deportations and genocide, a terribly tangible demonstration of that disregard for the dignity of the human person which is central to the Communist credo. There is, in other words, no escape from the struggle in which all freedom-loving peoples are involved; the struggle surrounds us on all sides. The protagonists in the struggle are all peoples who believe in human liberty, peace and justice and are willing to dedicate their efforts to the attainment of those ends. The struggle against deceit and treachery, however, is a long and arduous one, and this can easily be seen if one reviews for a moment the events surrounding the barbarous absorption of Lithuania into the control of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania became a sacrifice to an infamous accord between Hitler and Stalin. When Soviet treachery materialized in the aggressive act of occupation, the first to protest were Lithuania's representatives abroad, while the first foreign reaction was the condemnation of the aggression by U.S. Acting Secretary of State Sumner Wells. Thus, the Lithuanian cause was from the very beginning projected into an international arena. From that time on, the Soviets have repeatedly attempted to present the supposed incorporation of Lithuania as a free choice of the people. It has thus become part of the Lithuanian struggle to regain freedom and independence that such a clumsy lie be unmasked, and that the facts behind the Soviet occupation of Lithuania be accurately revealed as an ill-concealed act of criminal aggression on the part of the Kremlin. The efforts of Lithuanians living in the free world have long been dedicated to a full and accurate presentation of the facts, and their efforts were saliently supported when a U.S. congressional committee under the direction of Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin investigated the Soviet aggression in the Baltic States and came to this conclusion:

"The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R. Any claims by the U.S.S.R. that the elections conducted by them in July 1940 were free and voluntary (or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal) are false and without foundation in fact."

In the light of all the evidence, the Soviet action in the Baltic States has become one of the clearest examples of Soviet aggression and neo-colonialism. Even though the Soviets have tried to achieve recognition of the status quo in the Baltic States, the free world has seen their attempts as only a continuation of the series of clumsy lies to which the free world is now accustomed. Other nations of the free world have joined with the United States in refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States, realizing that the expression of any such sanction, whether directly or indirectly, would be tantamount to the awarding of a prize for unprecedented disregard of international agreements and the principles of justice and peace among nations. This position has great political and legal significance, for it enables Lithuanian representatives to continue their duties and the defense of Lithuanian rights and interests.

Even a Soviet representative such as Litvinov did not fail to note the significance of the nonrecognition policy, for he said:

"It would be quite wrong * * * to assert that resolutions on nonrecognition are in themselves devoid of any particular value. While such resolutions have in every case a certain moral significance, and give satisfaction to public opinion, they also cause the aggressor some preoccupations and inconveniences, as is evident by the efforts which aggressors usually make to obtain recognition of their conquests, if only in an indirect way. But, according to circumstances, nonrecognition may be of vast importance, not only morally, but also politically—particularly when the victim of aggression itself continues to fight for its independence and for the integrity of its territory. In such cases, the recognition of the results of violent aggression or the abandonment of the policy of nonrecognition, would be equivalent to abbetting the aggressor directly, and to stabbing his victim in the back by discouraging and demoralizing it." (League of Nations Official Journal, 1938, pp. 340–341.)

Finally, I might note in this respect that the refusal of Western nations to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States conforms to an old principle of law, namely that unjust actions do not have just consequences. Ex injuria jus non oritur. It is with regard for this principle, as well as for the other considerations I have mentioned, that the Lithuanian diplomatic representatives maintain the just aspirations of Lithuania to freedom and independence. And part of their task has repeatedly been that of combating Soviet attempts to

achieve indirect recognition of the illegal situation in Lithuania and the other Baltic States. This task has been carried on in conjunction with the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and the American Lithuanian Council, as well as other organizations which perform special functions related to the common task confronting Lithuanians living in the free world.

In this struggle for justice, the Lithuanian people have many good friends, and it is my pleasure to mention some of them here. I speak first of all of Mayor Samuel Yorty of Los Angeles, who has often demonstrated a keen awareness of the effort involved in combating Communist propaganda and treachery. We are most grateful to him for his official proclamation in connection with this commemoration, and for the ceremony whereby the Lithuanian flag was raised in honor at city hall this morning. We also cherish the presence here today of the distinguished dean of the Los Angeles Consular Corps, Dr. Mong-ping Lee, the Consul General of China; and the Consul General of Canada, the Honorable George R. Paterson and Mrs. Paterson. Lithuanians everywhere are particularly grateful for the friendship of the Chinese people, who are also engaged in a struggle to regain their rightful freedom and territorial sovereignty. We deeply appreciate the numerous occasions on which the Chinese representative at the United Nations has espoused the Lithuanian cause, at a time when the official voice of the Lithuanian people is silenced in that body. And Lithuanians are also grateful to the government and people of Canada for having made possible the reestablishment of an Acting Consul General in Canada. We are also very happy to have with us today the last American Minister to Lithuania before the forcible Soviet occupation, Dr. Owen J. C. Norem and Mrs. Norem. I happened to be the first person to greet Dr. Norem officially when he arrived in Lithuania, and so I am very happy, during this visit, to renew an acquaintance of long standing. In days when such travel was difficult, Prof. Malbone Graham twice visited Lithuania, and has always been a great friend of our country; he has also dedicated much effort to numerous scholarly writings on Lithuania. He is not able to be with us today because of illness, and I know that I express the desire of all of us in wishing him a speedy recovery.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the Lithuanians who gather here today do not stand alone; they have friends who share their aspirations for a better world in which justice will be the cornerstone of individual and national liberty. This kind of alliance is a natural one by virtue of our goals, but it can never be taken for granted. The solidarity that the free world is ever seeking to strengthen is the result, not of idle maxims chanted, but of difficult lessons clearly learned. Just as the descendants of the American pioneer learned through bitter experience that freedom-loving peoples must stand together, so too have freedom-loving peoples learned that mere noble desires and aspirations do not guarantee peace and happiness. The tragic fate of Lithuania is one of the clearest examples of his. Even where dedicated men gave of all their energies to build a free and independent Lithuania, their noble work was overwhelmed by treachery and ruthless greed. And the reason is simple: evil men have an unlimited number of means available whereby to achieve nefarious ends, whereas seekers after justice have but a narrow path of principle and faith to follow.

Yet in spite of this, all of us gathered here are determined to believe in justice, and to work for it. It is only the strong of mind and heart who are able to believe perseveringly in justice—who are able to set aside doubts and fears, and to see truly that mankind's yearning for peace and freedom is rarely rewarded overnight. And even when peace and freedom are achieved, they cannot be maintained without courage and hard work. As Erasmus once said, "God indeed preserves the ship, but the mariner conducts it into harbor." And it is above all faith in a just cause which enables men to persevere, in spite of obstacles, in the noble quest for a better world.

Neither the Hitlerite nor the Soviet occupation has dimmed the Lithuanian people's bright hope of freedom. History teaches that tyrants may have temporary success in defeating just aspirations, but in the end they fall to very low depths indeed. Such, even in our own time, is the paradoxical fate of Josef Stalin. His removal from honored interment to an obscure grave by the Kremlin wall shows quite well that justice has a habit of burying its own undertakers. And this pattern will persist as long as men are willing to fight and die for the freedom which is synonymous with life for them—whether at Thermopylae or Bunker Hill or Budapest or the Berlin wall or the forests of Lithuania.

This is a year of anniversaries. Not only do we mark the 45th year since Lithuania's Declaration of Independence in modern times, but also the 710th anniversary of the foundation of the kingdom of Lithuania under King Mindaugas. And at the same time that we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the great Lithuanian uprising against czarist domination. The pattern of liberty and justice is woven firmly into the lives of Lithuanians. Though they now experience "the perilous night," as did Francis Scott Key, they know that the day will come and that, "with the dawn's early light," their flag will still be there. Long may it wave.

In closing, I would like to read to you the text of a letter for which Lithuanians everywhere will be grateful. It speaks for itself. It is in connection with this anniversary, and I am happy that it reached me in time for me to read it to you:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1963.

"DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: Permit me to convey, in the name of the Government and the people of the United States, the warm regard of this country for the Lithuanian nation on the occasion of its 45th anniversary of independent statehood. Americans remain strongly convinced that your people, like all other nations, are entitled to freedom and national self-determination. For this reason our Government continues not to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania in the Soviet Union. We are confident that the proven devotion of Lithuanians to liberty and justice, with which many of them have enriched our own shores, will serve their nation well in its efforts to achieve the eventual restoration of its rights.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 45th anniversary of Estonian independence, and I am honored to join my fellow Americans in observing this important milestone in the life of a brave captive nation.

It was on February 24, 1918, that the Estonian National Council declared that "as of today Estonia within its historical and ethnic boundaries, is proclaimed an independent, democratic republic." Since 1710 when Peter I conquered their homeland the Estonians had been living under the Russian yoke. Independence came after many uprisings and brutal reprisals, including the important 1905 revolution.

After Estonia's liberation the Russians tried to restore their control of the new Republic. The Communists staged an unsuccessful coup in 1924 and were outlawed. They went underground, however, to continue their subversive propaganda and espionage. The Soviets aggressive designs were finally realized in 1940 when they seized control of Estonia in violation of their pledges to respect Estonian sovereignty and to abstain from interference in the internal affairs of the country. Shortly Estonia was invaded by Nazi Germany and then reoccupied by the Red army in 1944. Since then the Estonians have been forcibly maintained as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

During its 20-year period of independence Estonia developed a stable and well-balanced economy, founded on the principles of private enterprise and initiative. But the expropriation and sovietization policies of the Kremlin destroyed the economic structure of independent Estonia and forced it into the economic mold of the Soviet Union. Estonia's farms were collectivized and its workers subjected to a 20th-century version of medieval serfdom.

The forcible annexation of Estonia and her Baltic neighbors is a bitter reminder of the dangers of Soviet totalitarianism. Although Estonia has fallen victim to Communist tyranny, the Estonian people are determined to resist their oppressors. On this anniversary we reaffirm our refusal to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic peoples and express our faith in their ultimate victory over tyranny.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the observance of an anniversary of the declaration of independence is an occasion for festivities and celebrations in most countries throughout the world. Yesterday we observed the 45th anniversary of the gaining of independence by the small Baltic country of Estonia. It is unfortunate that we cannot join in a celebration of this occasion with all our Estonian friends. The observance of this day serves more as a reaffirmation of the hope that Americans, and free Estonians

everywhere, have of seeing the reemergence of a free independent Estonia. It will only be then that we would join our Estonian friends in a joyful and glorious celebration.

Being a small nation Estonia has, for most of its modern history, been subjected to foreign rule. Its domination by Sweden was only replaced by Russian czarist rule. The realization of the national goal, nurtured throughout the centuries in the hearts of all Estonians, was finally achieved when Russia was in the chaos of a revolution. The Estonians proclaimed their independence on February 24, 1918. With the attainment of independence the Estonians undertook the responsibilities as citizens of a free nation and succeeded in not only rebuilding their devastated and ruined country, but also in advancing in all phases of national activity. However, the ever present Russian threat, now in the clothing of Soviet imperialism, brought about the annexation of Estonia by the U.S.S.R. in 1940.

In spite of all the odds against them, these hearty and valiant people, mindful of the hardships their ancestors went through to achieve independence, have not given up hope that their country will again be free. We admire this persevering hope and on this anniversary we reaffirm our determination never to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic nations and express our hope and prayer for their liberation.

Addresses Given on Occasion of Presentation of 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet, January 23, 1963: Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, Jean Monnet, and a Letter from President John F. Kennedy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 1962 Freedom Award, which is presented annually by Freedom House, was presented on January 23, 1963, to Jean Monnet of France.

Because of present discussions of the state of the Western alliance and because of the great contributions which Jean Monnet has made to the building of that alliance, I believe that Members of Congress will find particularly interesting the speeches which were delivered by a number of distinguished Americans on this occasion.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the texts of the addresses made by Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, and by Jean Monnet together with the text of a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy.

I should like first, however, to include at this point an editor's note concerning the Freedom House dinner which was published in the February 1963 issue of the journal, Freedom and Union. This issue of Freedom and Union carries the texts of these several addresses.

FULL TEXT OF FREEDOM HOUSE DINNER—MONNET, GAINING FREEDOM AWARD, UPHOLDS HIS PLAN FOR UNITED KINGDOM JOINING SIX AND ATLANTIC UNITY AGAINST DE GAULLE—BALL GIVES HIM J.F.K.'s BACKING

High drama marked the presentation of the 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet by Freedom House in New York City January 23. Only 9 days before its long-announced dinner for him, the basic strategy for European and Atlantic unification he had long led in developing was jeopardized by President de Gaulle at his press conference in Paris January 14, whose text we give on page 9. Most jeopardized were such essential parts as British entry into the Common Market and the concepts embodied in President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act and Atlantic partnership speech July 4.

The upheaval was basic and world shaking indeed, for reasons we seek to clarify in our editorial on page 1. Mr. Monnet almost canceled his trip to New York for the dinner, but ended by coming there to make his most important public statement after the upset—answering De Gaulle without naming him.

All this served to magnify the already great interest in his speech, and the preceding ones by George Ball, Under Secretary of State (who read a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy), former Secretary of State Christian Herter, now the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and columnist Walter Lippmann. To hear them, a distinguished crowd of some 1,400 packed the ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria; and press and TV-radio widely reported them. There follows the text of these speeches, in the order made. On page 25 we add a much fuller exposition of the views of Mr. Herter, a key figure in the coming acts in this drama * * *.—EDITORS.

ROSCOE DRUMMOND, CHAIRMAN, FREEDOM HOUSE, PRESIDING

I welcome you to the company of Freedom House and thank you for joining us in doing honor to the foremost European of our time, a great citizen of France who, more than any of his compatriots, strides with the tide of history.

I offer a brief word about Freedom House itself. In the dark days before Pearl Harbor, Freedom House grew out of the organizations of citizens who were deeply concerned about the mood of Americans who tended to regard Hitler and the Nazi threat to freedom as something about which we could be neutral. And we are not neutral today, when freedom is under more deadly attack than ever before.

Freedom House is an educational and service organization created to help preserve and strengthen our free society. Through the commitment of the time and talent of its board of directors and a contributing membership throughout the country, Freedom House has managed to carry its message to the American people in many ways—its message that today the real enemies are those who would bury freedom, and that in this struggle there is no alternative to the proposition—and the goal—that freemen shall prevail.

Liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats are comfortable under the roof of Freedom House, because within the framework of divergent judgments of how our ends can best be achieved, there is fundamental agreement.

The freedom award has been presented each year since 1943. Its first recipient, Walter Lippmann, will follow me soon on tonight's program in honor of Jean Monnet. Others on this platform who have previously received the freedom award are Gen. Lucius Clay, Dr. James Conant, Paul Hoffman, and David Lilienthal. The roster of previous recipients also includes Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Dean Acheson, Bernard Baruch, Gen. George Marshall, Edward R. Murrow, Sir Winston Churchill, and Mayor Willy Brandt. Tonight, Jean Monnet honors us by his visit and his acceptance of the freedom award, symbolizing our recognition of his great contribution to freedom.

MONNET TO PREVAIL

(By Walter Lippmann)

My friendship with Jean Monnet goes back to the early days of the League of Nations. Even then he was already launched on his great career. Amidst the violence and the tumult of the 20th century he stands out as the most constructive of the peacemakers.

He has spent his life in a persevering and persistent, in an ingenious and resourceful, labor of planning and negotiation and persuasion. In all his projects and enterprises there has been one central theme, which is how to induce and cajole men to work together for their own good. He has not asked men to be angels and saints, he has asked them to be sensible. He has not preached to them and he has never allowed himself to use the resounding generalities about peace and the unity of mankind. But he has been and he is now, at the summit of his career, the most effective planner and engineer of human unity whom we have known in our time.

I am presuming on a long friendship when I say a few words, not about what he has done, but about what he represents.

The principle of his work has been that peace and prosperity will come as men become enlightened in the pursuit of their interests. This is, I believe, the first article of the democratic credo—that enlightenment is possible and will produce the good life. The democratic credo does not say that men are born to govern themselves. It says that they can learn to govern themselves. And then, when education has enlightened the people, most of them will see that they can realize their own best private interest by working with and not against the enlightened public interest. This may be, as many think it is, a naive faith. I myself have wondered about it in some of the dark times we have lived through, and it may be that the good society can be realized on this earth only if mankind is reborn.

Jean Monnet has been a witness to the democratic faith—which is that there is a rational order in human affairs wherever and whenever men listen to reason and obey it. This faith in the paramountcy of reason is the source of that dauntless optimism which has made Jean Monnet so persevering—many of us would at times have said so stubborn—but so remarkably able to get done what he wants to do.

I am only too well aware that these are anxious days for all who are concerned with the great projects which he has initiated. This country is most concerned with them and with the unanswered questions of how the European Community will come to terms with its partners and allies in the Western World, and beyond them with its rivals in the Eastern World. All will depend, I imagine, on whether in the negotiations across the channel, and then across the Atlantic, those who will make the decisions can conceive the future as closed and restrictive or as open and inclusive.

Enough of the faith and stubbornness of Jean Monnet has rubbed off on me so that I venture to say that there is no doubt as to whether the open conception will prevail over the closed. In the end it will prevail.

What we are anxious about these days is when and how soon it will prevail, whether we are to be set backward into separatism and division with all the wastes and the dangers that go with them or whether we can move forward toward greater unity in a progressively free world.

PARTNERSHIP CANNOT REMAIN FINAL OBJECTIVE OF EUROPE AND AMERICA—DEEPER TIE AHEAD

(By Christian A. Herter)

We have come here tonight to welcome and to honor a man who symbolizes for us in a very special way the new Europe that is coming into being.

Jean Monnet is in a real sense one of the principal founding fathers of this Europe. He is, at one and the same time, the foremost private citizen of the European community and also an undisputed son of France. In this dual citizenship he embodies a quality which is essential for everyone of us who wishes to contribute to strengthening the free world. Those of us who are on this side of the Atlantic must learn to live in the same moment as genuine Americans and also as citizens of the whole Atlantic area in our cares and outlook.

We are accustomed to welcoming distinguished French gentlemen to our shores, but seldom have we extended a warmer welcome than we do tonight to Jean Monnet. Many of his predecessors in the 17th and 18th centuries helped to bring a new world into being in North America, and some of them contributed decisively to the establishment of this Republic. But Monnet has dared to undertake a far more formidable task than was ever undertaken by even the most distinguished of his predecessors. They explored and settled a virgin continent unbound by the traditions of the past, while he has called a new world into being in an old world bound by centuries of tradition.

It is an ironic and impressive fact that, if one looks for the newest frontier in the Western World, he will find it not in North America but in Western Europe. Jean Monnet is the most authentic new frontiersman of our time. He, more than most other men, understands the secret of how the miracle of remaking Europe was wrought.

What Jean Monnet has done, if he will permit me to say so, was to recognize and take advantage of one of those rare moments in history when it is possible to recreate society and build institutions better adapted to the requirements of the 20th century. He would be the first to recognize that his achievement has been possible only because the tides of human affairs were running in the direction of what he wanted.

After World War I it was evident that Europe must unite or run the risk of decline. The chance to unite came after World War II. That chance was seized and success appears probable.

But the forces of history are working over a wider area than Western Europe. What has been true of the Continent since 1918 is now true of the whole North Atlantic area. We have learned our lesson. The Atlantic area must achieve greater unity or we will be progressively weakened until eventually we lose our freedom. Unity of free men and of free societies is the price of survival as well as of liberty.

There is, of course, nothing inevitable about our achieving the unity necessary for survival. We know, however, that centuries of human struggle and suffering have produced the unique opportunity that now lies before us. Further, we believe that the achievement of this unity is in the nature of things and that the forces of history are working toward this end. We also know that the moment of opportunity could pass and that Western society could succumb once more to the barbarians hammering at our gates if people like ourselves in America and Western Europe are not equal to the task.

Progress has been made. There is an operating military alliance, though a good deal remains to be done if it is to become as effective as it should be.

On July 4 last, the President defined the relationship between the new Europe that is coming into being and the United States as one of active partnership. The practice of partnership involves, as a first major step, the establishment of trade relations between the two partners that will serve their common interests, as well as the interests of each, to the maximum degree possible.

Partnership, however, good as it is, can never remain the ultimate and final objective of Europe and America. The forces of history are working toward a broader and deeper relationship than that. We are all (Europeans and Americans alike) heirs of the same great cultural heritage with similar views about the nature and destiny of man and the character of human society. In other words, we already belong to each other. Our task in the years ahead is to find out how to express the reality of this fact in institutional terms.

Some of us in this country prefer to talk about the future in terms of an Atlantic Community. I know that our European friends shy away from this phrase because for them the word "community" has already acquired a clear and precise meaning—technical, economic, and political—as the emerging structure of their continent. In short, they feel that the use of the word has already been preempted by Europe and that its use here to describe our ultimate goal merely produces confusion of thought and intention.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY—GOAL TOWARD WHICH JEAN MONNET LEADS

At the same time, for many Americans, "community" is such a good word to describe relationships between people that I suspect some of us will continue to use it. I am a New Englander. In New England we say "community" when we are thinking about a society in which people live together as good neighbors, with a common recognition of the supremacy of law, and sharing the benefits of varied economic and political institutions while united by their common cultural heritage and by their feeling of a common destiny. It is in this sense that I speak of the Atlantic community—a goal toward which Jean Monnet's path leads.

The path to that community or partnership, if you prefer, will at times be steep and hazardous. The road upon which we have embarked will not be easy. Setbacks of the kind we are now witnessing are perhaps to be expected. It is inherent in a free society that men should differ on matters of policy between those who see their proper interests or the interests of their respective nations in different terms. At times these differences may well appear to be irreconcilable but I am confident that with the momentum already achieved we will overcome these differences.

History does not consist of a stream of events flowing at the same rate of speed. History unfolds by fits and starts. In the course of our human pilgrimage, sometimes centuries have passed by without there existing much possibility of creative change. Then a moment comes when change is possible if men are at hand who are willing to take advantage of it. Such a moment, thanks to Jean Monnet, is now with us.

MR. EUROPE CAN BECOME A MAJORITY

(By George W. Ball)

First of all, I am serving as a courier to deliver a letter from the President of the United States to Jean Monnet, and I would like to read this letter [printed at end of speech].

And now, if I may, let me add a few personal observations about a man whom it has been my great fortune to know for 20 years. All who have enjoyed the close friendship of Jean Monnet—and our number is legion—can recount innumerable incidents to illustrate his qualities as a friend—his generosity and compassion, his warmth and thoughtfulness, his genuine concern for the problems of others.

But Jean Monnet would be impatient with me were I to pursue this theme tonight. No man has ever cared less for personal adulation and he has not come here for that purpose. Jean Monnet has not flown across the Atlantic at a time of crisis to receive personal honor but rather to participate in honoring and explaining those ideas of which he is a symbol in the hope that they may be even better understood.

ATLANTIC TIE MOST SIGNIFICANT

So tonight I shall not speak of Jean Monnet, that warm, gallant, and modest friend from Cognac. Neither shall I seek to expound his ideas, for he will do that much better himself. Rather I shall say a few words about that almost legendary figure of epic stature who has become known to an admiring world as Mr. Europe.

Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe, it seems to me, because he is preeminently a modern man. More deeply than any of us he has perceived the central discord of our complex time—the discord between our technology on the one hand, with its rapid pace of advance and its requirements of scope and scale, and, on the other hand, the institutional arrangements under which we live, so slow to change and so often parochial in character. The consequences of this discord are familiar to all of us. They are evident in the problems we deal with every day—the problems of our cities, of our schools, and of our transportation systems—not to mention our newspapers. But they find their most significant expression in the relations between the peoples of the Atlantic world, where defense is indivisible, where economic life is interdependent, and where the major political decisions must of necessity be taken in concert if the full strength of the free world is to be effectively mobilized against a common danger.

OBSOLETE, FIERCELY HELD IDEAS

Because Jean Monnet has seen this fact with crystal clarity he has striven to transform the nation states of Europe into a new unity, not merely to end forever the frictions that more than once have embroiled the whole world in sanguinary conflict but to enable Europe to contribute its full potential to the shaping of a better world. And at the same time he has sought to promote between Europe and the United States that close cooperation which can give real content and meaning to the Atlantic partnership.

These objectives have represented no utopian dream. Jean Monnet is indubitably hardheaded and pragmatic, but he recognizes a compelling logic in world affairs.

I have called Jean Monnet a modern man, but this does not mean that he is unaware or disdainful of the past. Indeed he has, I think, a profound sense of the meaning of history and of the deep forces it has generated. He has had the insight to recognize that history is not a static affair, not the constant replaying of old themes, but a flow of events which, if man is to survive, must be channeled in directions that meet the requirements of an evolving new age.

He has, therefore, never been tempted into the unhappy error—induced by a nostalgic longing for a world that never was—of seeking to recapture the past. He has not sought to unfurl ancient banners, reinstate old forms, revive the vanished symbols that beglamored the centuries gone by. Instead

he has pursued the more relevant purpose of bending men's efforts toward a nobler future.

It is because Jean Monnet so clearly perceives the nature of the great tidal forces at work in the world that he is sturdily immune to transient disappointments. I have been with him on more than one occasion when the movement of new ideas has seemed to many of us irrevocably halted by the abrupt intrusion of obsolete—yet fiercely held—ideas that echoed a distant and earlier age. Invariably—and sometimes almost alone—Jean Monnet has remained undismayed. At such moments of crisis his reaction is always the same. "What has happened, has happened," he is inclined to say, "but it does not affect anything fundamental. The important point is for us not to be deflected, not to lose momentum. We must go forward. We may alter our tactics but never our main objectives."

MONNET AN INCORRIGIBLE OPTIMIST

It is because of this apparent imperturbability that Jean Monnet is known—to the admiration of his friends and the exasperation of his opponents—as an incorrigible optimist. This attitude of mind does not stem from any panglossian idea that all is the best in the best of all possible worlds, but rather from a dauntless faith in the logic of events and the essential rationality of man—a faith in the ineluctable direction of deeply moving forces. Jean Monnet is an optimist because he is a practical man with a passionate desire to get things done—and for such a man optimism is the only useful working hypothesis.

As a practical man he pursues his purposes in a most practical way—a way that is peculiarly his own. Mr. Walter Lippmann has just spoken of him as a man who can "induce and cajole men to work together for their own good." To say it in other words, Jean Monnet is the supreme practitioner of the art of personal diplomacy. And he practices that art with unfailing perception of the loci of power and with an extraordinary singlemindedness.

Optimism works for him because he accepts opponents but not defeat. I still remember a book he once gave me—the story of an Arab prince who, in a time of troubles, went out to the desert to find the wisdom of the ages. The prince returned from his sojourn with this motto:

May God bless even my enemies.

For they too are a means to my end.

[Applause.]

It is by the vital force of his deep convictions, in short, that Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe—the keeper of the conscience of a continent. And he has demonstrated anew the ancient adage that a resolute man, plus the truth, can become a majority.

ESSENTIAL UNITED KINGDOM JOIN MARKET

(By Jean Monnet)

I am moved and embarrassed by what Mr. Lippmann, Mr. Herter, and Mr. Ball have said. I shall not try to answer them.

I am very honored to receive from the board of trustees of Freedom House the Freedom Award at your hands today. That you are giving this award to a European is a proof of the deep community of mind and feeling that unite the people of Europe and North America.

I am convinced this feeling is rooted in our common civilization, the essence of which is its tradition of freedom. This freedom truly is the main issue between the two ways of approaching life that compete for men's minds today.

So many people have written and spoken about liberty more thoroughly than I can that I want to limit myself to what seems to me the most important and urgent practical problem confronting the West and its tradition of freedom, the one that requires action from us today.

The worst enemies of freedom have been, and still are, the spirit of domination and its consequences, the threat of war.

While within our frontiers we have organized liberty and, by mutual consent, maintained the rule of law that largely eliminates the spirit of domination, internationally we are still maintaining peace by force.

Now we must go beyond national frontiers and create new forms of relationships between countries.

The next step ahead of us must clearly be to complete the unity of Europe including Britain [applause], and gradually develop a strong partnership of equals between the United States and Europe. [Applause.]

PEACE AND FREEDOM

These are essential for the organization of peace in the world and the maintenance of freedom.

For, as we progress toward the unity of the West, we will create the conditions favoring a lasting peace between the West and the Soviet Union.

Naturally, the process of putting these great aims into practice involves great changes in the form of relationships now existing between our nations. This brings us up against difficulties.

I would like to talk of the one that looms largest over us all at this moment. It is more than important, it is essential that Britain should join our European Community under the same conditions as the present members. The negotiations have been going on too long but they can be rapidly concluded.

We must remember that on fundamental issues, as two world wars have proved, Britain is part of Europe.

People in Britain and on the Continent must free their minds of the obsolete and static idea that Britain, because an island, is bound to be insular, that she does not belong to Europe and that her commercial policies and interests will keep her forever apart from the natural trend toward European unity.

Entry into Europe would be good for Britain, for Europe, for the West and for world peace. [Applause.]

I still hope and believe, like most people in the Six, that the negotiations on Britain's entry into Europe will succeed.

Those who have had anything to do with European unity known from their own experience that the difficulties encountered at any moment do not matter so long as the objective is kept clearly in view.

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC UNITY

The world has recently become aware of the success of European economic unity, and people everywhere see political unity emerging in Europe. But this sudden awareness has concealed the 12 years of work, and often of serious trouble, that lie behind the achievement.

When the treaty for the European Defense Community was rejected in 1954, most competent observers thought unity in Europe was dead and buried. And yet the progress we have made during the last 12 years shows that, despite all the difficulties, we are on the way.

The countries of continental Europe—France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux—are uniting in a European Economic Community of nearly 200 million people.

Germany and France, which have struggled to dominate one another for centuries, are now coming together, accepting the fact that they have the same destiny. In the European Economic Community they are pursuing a common course of action which is gradually transforming their mutual relations and the outlook of their peoples. They have even been considering closer cooperation in all fields. I have no doubt that France, which has been, from the start, a founder of European unity, will follow this course. [Applause.]

Why is this profound change taking place?

It is because the countries of the European Community have agreed that their economic problems which, in the past, were national responsibilities, have now become common responsibilities and being common, unite them instead of dividing them.

It is because they have established common rules and common institutions that they can do the job.

It is because each of the steps they have taken one after another, as circumstances allowed, have been designed to further the same objective.

The European Coal and Steel Community which was the beginning of all this enterprise, was not set up just to pool coal and steel, but as a first step on the way to European union.

THE COMMON MARKET

The Common Market has not been created just to build a better system of exchanging goods, or to create a new power. We have had, and have, as our objectives, essentially the creation of a united Europe and the elimination between nations and their peoples of the spirit of domination that has brought the world close to destruction many times.

To produce such a change, it was essential to eliminate the feeling of discrimination between nations that was the inevitable consequence of the many European wars.

To begin to unite Europe only 5 years after the war, it was vital that everyone should see that there were no more victors or vanquished, but only partners equal before the common law.

The institutions of the Common Market work in such a way that discrimination between European nations has now been ended.

The independent European Commission is the authority empowered to propose the economic policies of the Community. The national governments whose representatives sit in the Council of Ministers, decide on the common policies proposed by the Commission according to the rules and spirit of the Rome Treaty. In a widening field its decisions no longer require unanimity.

The attitudes of the people of Europe are rapidly changing. The peoples of these Community countries, the producers, the farmers, labor and the members of the professions, have become partners in change and are taking on the same Community outlook.

In fact when you look at it, they are the same people as they have been for centuries, but their attitudes toward one another have changed.

This is the process of civilization itself.

This process is taking us faster and further than anyone would have dared to hope after the war.

Britain's request to enter the European union is one sign of it.

Another is your President's speech on the last 4th of July, where he called for a partnership of equals between the United States of America and the European Community. You are now preparing to negotiate new trade links across the Atlantic which must serve the interests of the world as a whole.

AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR EUROPEAN UNITY

Ever since the Marshal plan, and the Schuman plan, American support for European unity has never faltered.

I can testify from my own experience that this support has been invaluable in bringing European unity to the point where it is today. For once, the most powerful country in the world has helped others to unite instead of adopting the old principle of divide and rule.

But during all those years, the United States took her decisions alone. Now the partnership means a new form of relations.

Let me read to you what the Action Committee of the United States of Europe said on this matter in its joint declaration of June 26 last:

"The partnership between America and a united Europe must be a relationship of two separate but equally powerful entities, each bearing its share of common responsibilities in the world. This partnership is natural and inevitable because the peoples of Europe and America share the same civilization based on freedom and conduct their public life in accordance with common democratic principles."

I think this has implications for defense which, with the entry of Britain into the Common Market, is the main problem that looms over the great debate in the West.

We must recognize in this nuclear age, that while making every effort to disarm, we must pursue and improve our common defense with all its political implications on both sides of the Atlantic.

Europe and America must both acknowledge that neither of us is defending a particular country, that we are all defending our common civilization. [Applause.]

You, in the United States, must realize that the claims of Europe to share common responsibility and authority for decisions on defense, including the nuclear weapons, is natural since any decision involves the very existence of the European peoples.

EUROPE'S SHARE OF DEFENSE

On the other hand, I think the Europeans must understand that the nuclear terror is indivisible and that they too must shoulder an adequate share of the common defense.

Today, however, the countries of the Atlantic Alliance have such divergent views of their immediate interests that a common approach to the problem has to be developed if agreement is to be achieved.

To achieve the partnership between Europe and America, we must create an increasingly common interest by acting in common on a growing number of questions. When sufficient points of common interest have been created, a degree of community in defense will be accepted that today appears utopian.

In my opinion, while progress on defense must be sought continuously, the field where results can be most promptly obtained is the economic one.

There are urgent problems which neither Europe nor America can settle alone. These are, to my mind, the monetary stability of the West, the organization of agriculture in an increasingly industrial world, help to the developing countries to speed their growth and, of course, the freeing of trade to be negotiated between yourselves and the Common Market.

I realize that economic partnership will not automatically lead to a partnership for defense. In Europe too, the Common Market alone is not enough to create political union. But without the Common Market, political union would never have been raised as a practical issue. Similarly, the creation of the rules and institutions needed to build up the economic partnership between the United States and Europe will change the context for dealing with defense. It will then appear in a new light on both sides of the Atlantic.

The unity of Europe and its partnership with the United States will not only change the relationship between us, it will fundamentally change the relationship of the West with the Soviet Union.

As long as Russia believes the West can be divided, it will be tempted to upset the balance of power in its favor.

As we organize new forms of relationship between the Western nations, we will be showing ourselves, the Soviet Union and the rest of the world, that as a result of the union of Europe and its partnership with the United States, the West cannot be divided.

The conditions will then exist for establishing the basis of lasting peace between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

I believe this development can come much faster than we imagine today. My hope is based on my experience of European unity. This experience has been that once people are convinced a new situation is inevitable, they adapt themselves to it spontaneously and by doing so, hasten the process itself.

This is the most helpful road to the creation of peace today, and to the consolidation of freedom. [Ovation.]

UNITED STATES, EUROPE DEFEND COMMON CIVILIZATION

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 22, 1963.

His Excellency JEAN MONNET,
President, Action Committee for the United States of Europe.

DEAR MR. MONNET: I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance—and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic world.

For centuries, emperors, kings, and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than 20 years than it had done before in a thousand. You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of United States policy, for we have recognized with you that in unity lies strength. And we have also recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, working in full and effective partnership, can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16 in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that "Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization." The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Nahum 1: 7: *The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that daily we may be lifted by the mighty tides of Thy gracious spirit into the glad assurance that Thou art able and willing to help us meet faithfully all our tasks and responsibilities.

Grant that we may be inspired to put the various problems of life in the right perspective for we are frequently far more conscious of our perplexities than we are of Thy divine power which we may appropriate by faith.

May it be our highest wisdom to trust in Thee and go forth with a firm and calm reliance that we shall be guided by Thee in the high adventure of building a nobler civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO LIBERATE CUBANS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Russian occupation of Cuba, a nation of the Western Hemisphere, has sounded an alarm in every city, village, and hamlet of the New World. The voices of concern raised in the United States are many. One voice raised Sunday merits the careful study and, in my judgment, the support of every straight-thinking American. I refer to that great man from Independence, Mo., the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

Former Presidents of our country by tradition are properly regarded as the elder statesmen and their counsel in times of crisis has much significance. The man from Independence is known throughout the world as the man of decision. In the stormy days of his administration when our Nation carried almost singlehanded the great burden of freedom's cause against the imperial tyranny of the Russians, it was he who stemmed the tide of Communist aggression and launched programs to buttress the frontiers of freedom throughout the world. When the chips were down he acted with a resolute will and determination which rallied our Nation and the friends of freedom on farflung fronts. Harry S. Truman has won a special place in the hearts of his countrymen by the boldness of his vision and the determination of his purposes.

Now, when the frontiers of freedom are many, when the United States has strong and able allies in common cause, when the Russian empire shows strong signs of internal conflict which the masters in the Kremlin cannot control, when the security of the entire Western Hemisphere is directly challenged by the new imperialism of Moscow—the man from