



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 1963

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

Msgr. Bela Varga, chairman, the Hungarian Committee, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Almighty Father, Thou hast made this day, the ides of March, forever memorable to the people of Hungary. Thou gavest strength to them on March 15, 1848, to rise as one man in the struggle for freedom, as Thou didst aid them in 1956.

Freedom is the greatest treasure Thou hast given to man; and now this great treasure of mankind is being threatened with annihilation. Throughout the world, evil forces are destroying the happiness of nations who succumb to this diabolical power, even though free individuals are ready to fight this evil to death. Strengthen in the hour of temptation those who are suffering in the fight for freedom. Lend, O Lord, Thy guiding hands to the spiritual leader of Thy Hungarian nation, that he may fulfill his national and universal mission.

The Hungarian people have shed rivers of blood for liberty. Grant, O Lord, that their sacrifices alleviate their sufferings under the yoke of the cruel oppressor. As I am praying to Thee, O Almighty God, here in this great hall of freedom, I implore Thee to strengthen the Nation, Thy blessed people of America, that has become the leader of this struggle for freedom.

Give them, O Lord, Thy never-ending succor to their President, to their Senate and Congress, that they may never falter in their brave endeavors to secure the final victory of freedom throughout the world for Thy greater glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the committee I did not object to the nomination of Mr. Hartigan, nor do I object now. But I believe the RECORD should show that on August 3, 1961, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings on the nomination of William J. Hartigan to be Assistant Postmaster General for the Bureau of Transportation. The committee reported favorably his nomination to the Senate on August 3, and the Senate confirmed his nomination on August 4, 1961.

On March 3, 1962, Mr. Hartigan resigned as Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation, to return to his State of Massachusetts to engage in a political campaign. After the election, he returned to Washington, and the President resubmitted his nomination for the same job as Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation.

On March 13, 1963, this nomination was again before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for approval. Again the committee has reported it favorably to the Senate.

In the committee, I did not object to his nomination, nor am I objecting now. But I do think the RECORD should show that in less than 8 months after confirmation, Mr. Hartigan resigned from the Post Office Department, to actively engage in a State political campaign, and that after the campaign was over, he asked to be reconfirmed by the Senate.

I do not think it is good Government policy for a man to come in and serve a little while, and then have the idea that he can leave, and can manage a political campaign, and subsequently can return and can get his job back.

As I stated at our committee meeting, I am not very happy about this procedure, and I hope it is not a precedent; but I am not going to raise an objection to confirmation of this nomination. Such a practice as is here indicated, if carried out extensively, would not lend itself to good government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the new reports.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

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

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

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Federal Communications Commission.

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

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

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

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

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

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

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT
AMENDMENTS OF 1963

A letter from the Acting Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE
U.S.A., INC.

A letter from the National Quartermaster, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR
TECHNICAL CAPACITY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF INEFFECTIVE REPAIR
PARTS SUPPORT FOR COMBAT AND COMBAT-
SUPPORT VEHICLES BY ARMY TANK-AUTO-
MOTIVE CENTER, DETROIT, MICH.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich., dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE
FOREIGN SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT UNDER MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND
TRAINING ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the Manpower Development and Training Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 19

"Joint resolution relative to Edwards Air Force Base

"Whereas the State of California contains within its boundaries Edwards Air Force Base, an existing Government-owned facility, adequate in size and almost fully developed as a ground recovery station for orbital space vehicles, over which astronauts in the X-15 rocket plane have been launched more than 50 miles into space and returned; and

"Whereas the weather at this location provides more nearly perfect visibility than any other spot in the continental United States, having visibility in excess of 10 miles and a ceiling higher than 10,000 feet 94 percent of the time, and being absolutely clear more than 60 percent of the time; and

"Whereas the existing facilities at Edwards Air Force Base include the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Flight Research Center and the Air Force Astronaut Training Center, with more than \$250 million worth of complementary, NASA and Air Force buildings, radar, radio telemetry, computer and modular display equipment; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base contains nearly 400 square miles of flat and moderately hilly uninhabited land, with several thousand square miles of sparsely inhabited land adjoining to the east and north, over which air traffic is restricted; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base and its NASA installation are only 90 miles from Goldstone Radar Tracking Station (one of the best in the world), only 150 miles from Vandenberg Air Force Base and the Pacific Missile Range, and are less than 100 miles from three major universities and NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and only 100 miles from the highly skilled labor pool and sophisticated research and test facilities of the Los Angeles aerospace complex; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base is only 3 degrees north of the 32.5-degree inclination of the Mercury flight orbits and is at the same time well away from international boundaries, providing adequate security in case of secret payloads; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and all Federal agencies with jurisdiction in the matter to designate, actuate, and further develop Edwards Air Force Base as the primary U.S. space vehicle ground recovery station; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution relative to the establishment of a new national cemetery

"Whereas the Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery is the only national cemetery in southern California; and

"Whereas there being an average of 15 interments for each working day, available space for interments is diminishing at an alarming rate; and

"Whereas it is, and will continue to be, traditionally proper to provide fitting memorial cemeteries for the interment of deceased veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States and for their eligible dependents, as is now evidenced by the memorial cemeteries now in existence; and

"Whereas in the area which contains the counties of San Diego, Riverside, Orange, Imperial and San Bernardino, State of California, there resides a population composed of an extremely high percentage of veterans, as compared to other sections of the United States; and

"Whereas in 1945, the office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, recommended to the then Congress that a new national cemetery of an adequate size be established in the San Diego area, and if and when legislation is enacted, steps be taken toward the selection of a site and acquisition of the necessary property on which to establish a national cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery of an adequate size on U.S. Government-owned property at former Camp Elliott Naval Reservation, now declared excess to the General Services Administration, or at another suitable location on U.S. Government-owned property; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure. I ask that this concurrent resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 196

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and

Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and

Whereas the enacting into law the President's proposal will most certainly affect the economy of the State very adversely; and

Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have, through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land

formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS ON UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS BY COMMITTEES IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Appropriations, and Foreign Relations concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by these committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

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

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Young, Stephen: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Germany..... | Deutsche mark. | 439.56 | 109.89 | 487.00 | 121.75 | 80.00 | 20.00 | 100.00 | 25.00 | 1,106.56 | 276.64 |
| Italy..... | Lira..... | 38,191.50 | 61.50 | 39,278.25 | 63.25 | | | 15,525.00 | 25.00 | 92,994.75 | 149.75 |
| France..... | Franc..... | 362.90 | 74.06 | 445.9 | 91.00 | 98.00 | 20.00 | 98.00 | 20.00 | 1,004.80 | 205.06 |
| Spain..... | Pesets..... | 2,151.05 | 36.44 | 3,459.17 | 58.60 | | | 590.30 | 10.00 | 6,200.52 | 105.04 |
| Austria..... | Schilling..... | 2,314.80 | 90.00 | 4,243.80 | 165.00 | | | 941.35 | 36.60 | 7,499.95 | 291.60 |
| Galloway, Eilene: ¹ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Austria..... | do..... | 2,315 | 90.00 | 2,624 | 102.00 | 1,286 | 50.00 | 775 | 30.16 | 7,000 | 272.16 |
| Germany..... | Deutsche mark. | | | | | 5,154.8 | 1,288.70 | | | 5,154.8 | 1,288.70 |
| Cannon, Howard: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Switzerland..... | Swiss franc..... | 196 | 45.50 | 175 | 40.00 | 35 | 8.00 | 44.00 | 10.00 | 450.00 | 103.50 |
| Do..... | Deutsche mark. | | | | | 2,356.49 | 590.60 | | | 2,356.49 | 590.60 |
| Total..... | | | 507.39 | | 641.60 | | 1,977.30 | | 156.76 | | 3,283.05 |

¹ Included Bulgaria.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 3,283.05

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--|-------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Senator Gordon Allott: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Switzerland | Swiss franc | 73.70 | 16.96 | 63 | 14.51 | 21.80 | 5.02 | 13.30 | 3.07 | 171.80 | 39.56 |
| France | New franc | 260.40 | 53.12 | 163.15 | 33.28 | | | 303.45 | 61.97 | 727 | 148.37 |
| Italy | Lira | | | 41,216 | 66.37 | 164,862 | 265.48 | 22,784 | 36.69 | 228,862 | 368.54 |
| Germany | Deutsche mark | | | | | 4,392.19 | 1,100.80 | | | 4,392.19 | 1,100.80 |
| Total | | | 70.08 | | 114.16 | | 1,371.30 | | 101.73 | | 1,657.27 |
| Senator Allen J. Ellender: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | Peseta | | | | | | | | | 2,365 | 139.25 |
| Morocco | Dirham (franc) | | | | | | | | | 81.15 | 16.20 |
| Guinea | Franc | | | | | | | | | 3,275 | 13.40 |
| Ghana | Pound | | | | | | | | | 3-8-2 | 9.52 |
| Nigeria | do | | | | | | | | | 67.7 | 188.58 |
| Republic of South Africa | Rupee | | | | | | | | | 70 | 98.70 |
| Egypt | Egyptian pound | | | | | | | | | 17,200 | 39.56 |
| Libya (Benghazi) | Libyan pound | | | | | | | | | 5.12 | 14.33 |
| Tripoli (Libya) | do | | | | | | | | | 29.95 | 133.86 |
| France | New franc | | | | | | | | | 119.20 | 24.33 |
| Do | do | | | | | | 1,481.80 | | | 7,260.90 | 1,481.80 |
| Total | | | | | | | 1,481.80 | | | | 2,009.53 |
| Senator Roman L. Hruska: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| United States: Hawaii | Dollar | | 249.40 | | 102.86 | | 790.68 | | 73.25 | | 1,216.19 |
| Tokyo | do | | | | 9.89 | | | | 8.84 | | 18.73 |
| Tokyo Crown Province | Yen | 9,762 | 27.34 | 6,115 | 17.13 | | | 14,123 | 39.56 | 30,000 | 84.03 |
| Okinawa | Dollar | | 1.50 | | 3.50 | | | | 5.00 | | 10.00 |
| Taipei | do | | 10.20 | | .89 | | 1.50 | | 2.97 | | 15.56 |
| Hong Kong | do | | 7.03 | | 10.25 | | 7.50 | | 10.87 | | 35.65 |
| Vietnam | do | | | | 1.25 | | | | | | 1.25 |
| Vietnam Crown province | Piaster | 2,020.20 | 28.25 | 579 | 8.09 | | | 300.40 | 4.20 | 2,899.60 | 40.54 |
| Republic of Philippines | Dollar | | 19.27 | | 14.93 | | 3.50 | | 48.22 | | 85.92 |
| Guam | do | | 2.00 | | 3.94 | | | | .25 | | 6.19 |
| Kwajalein | do | | | | 5.94 | | | | 4.05 | | 9.99 |
| Total | | | 344.99 | | 178.67 | | 803.18 | | 197.21 | | 1,524.05 |
| Senator Hubert Humphrey and administrative assistant: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Venezuela | U.S. dollar | | 240.00 | | 117.50 | | 50.00 | | 35.00 | | 442.50 |
| Panama | do | | 32.70 | | 23.50 | | 7.50 | | 5.00 | | 68.70 |
| Costa Rica | do | | 88.20 | | 48.00 | | 12.00 | | 15.00 | | 163.20 |
| El Salvador | do | | 27.00 | | 23.50 | | | | 5.50 | | 56.00 |
| Honduras | do | | 28.36 | | 21.25 | | 5.35 | | 7.25 | | 62.21 |
| Guatemala | do | | 75.00 | | 41.00 | | 20.00 | | 13.50 | | 149.50 |
| Mexico | Peso | 4,937.50 | 395.00 | 2,509.75 | 200.75 | 1,312.50 | 105.00 | 240.62 | 19.25 | 9,000.37 | 720.00 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | | | 21.50 | | | | 11.74 | | 33.24 |
| Total | | | 886.26 | | 497.00 | | 199.85 | | 112.24 | | 1,695.35 |
| Senator Estes Kefauver: France | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | New franc | 1,068.20 | 218.00 | 1,151.50 | 235.00 | 294.00 | 60.00 | 122.50 | 25.00 | 2,636.20 | 538.00 |
| Total | | | 218.00 | | 235.00 | | 60.00 | | 25.00 | | 538.00 |
| Senator Thomas H. Kuchel: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Germany | Deutsche mark | 129.17 | 32.37 | 339.63 | 85.12 | 89.93 | 22.54 | 281.97 | 70.67 | 840.70 | 210.70 |
| Italy | Lira | 33,170 | 53.41 | 20,797 | 33.49 | 90,398 | 145.57 | 10,000 | 16.10 | 154,365 | 248.57 |
| The Azores, Germany, Spain, and Italy | U.S. dollar | | | | | | | | | | 121.74 |
| Total | | | 85.78 | | 118.61 | | 168.11 | | 86.77 | | 581.01 |
| Senator Gale W. McGee: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| French Oceania | U.S. dollar | | 17.54 | | 17.28 | | 3.66 | | 38.61 | | 77.01 |
| American Samoa | do | | | | 1.50 | | 1.50 | | 1.66 | | 3.16 |
| Fiji Islands | do | | 3.08 | | 4.06 | | | | 9.38 | | 16.52 |
| New Guinea | do | | 11.17 | | 9.11 | | 11.13 | | 3.68 | | 35.09 |
| Indonesia | do | | 39.72 | | 20.73 | | 4.91 | | 25.49 | | 90.85 |
| Malaya | Malayan dollar | | | 203.02 | 66.86 | 72.51 | 23.88 | 14.50 | 4.78 | 290.03 | 95.52 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 21.54 | | 14.16 | | 5.04 | | 25.49 | | 66.23 |
| Cambodia | Rial | 1,128 | 32.38 | 2,506 | 71.94 | 5,136 | 147.48 | 1,080 | 27.91 | 9,850 | 279.71 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 21.35 | | 29.92 | | 2.68 | | 17.06 | | 71.01 |
| Vietnam | Piaster | 2,046 | 28.08 | 2,728 | 37.44 | 3,136 | 43.64 | 2,115 | 28.53 | 10,025 | 137.69 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 41.10 | | 3.08 | | | | 17.70 | | 61.88 |
| Philippines | Peso | | | 490.55 | 126.37 | 173.10 | 43.16 | 132.32 | 33.03 | 795.97 | 202.56 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 22.00 | | 18.32 | | .75 | | 41.75 | | 82.82 |
| Hong Kong | Hong Kong dollar | 261 | 45.44 | 569 | 99.12 | 282 | 46.73 | 342 | 56.93 | 1,454 | 248.22 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 29.46 | | 35.11 | | | | 15.42 | | 79.99 |
| Taiwan | New Taiwan dollar | 508 | 12.72 | 660 | 16.54 | 787 | 19.72 | 585 | 14.62 | 2,540 | 63.60 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 18.75 | | 5.02 | | | | 3.85 | | 27.62 |
| Okinawa | do | | 1.50 | | 5.37 | | | | | | 6.87 |
| Korea | Hwan | | | 2,109 | 16.32 | 1,974 | 15.26 | 2,732 | 21.05 | 68.16 | 52.63 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | 3.33 |
| Japan | Yen | 21,660 | 86.16 | 22,863 | 90.95 | 37,750 | 151.05 | 7,583 | 30.52 | 89,856 | 358.68 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 40.92 | | 22.60 | | 1.40 | | 11.05 | | 75.97 |
| Total | | | 472.91 | | 710.30 | | 521.99 | | 431.84 | | 2,137.04 |
| Senator Milton R. Young: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| United States | Dollar | | | | | | 251.35 | | | | 251.35 |
| Puerto Rico | do | | 168.00 | | 170.13 | | 3.00 | | 50.08 | | 391.21 |
| Haiti | do | | 24.00 | | 37.95 | | | | 22.50 | | 84.45 |
| Guantanamo Bay | do | | | | 5.00 | | | | | | 5.00 |
| Total | | | 192.00 | | 213.08 | | 254.35 | | 72.58 | | 732.01 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|---|------------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Patricia M. Byrne: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| United States..... | Dollar..... | | | | | | 251.35 | | | | 251.35 |
| Puerto Rico..... | do..... | | 136.00 | | 55.87 | | 3.00 | | 32.53 | | 227.40 |
| Haiti..... | do..... | | 24.00 | | 22.00 | | | | 23.09 | | 69.09 |
| Guantanamo Bay..... | do..... | | | | 4.85 | | | | | | 4.85 |
| Total..... | | | 160.00 | | 82.72 | | 254.35 | | 55.62 | | 552.69 |
| Sebastino J. Castro: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| France..... | New franc..... | 459.75 | 93.83 | 341.63 | 69.72 | 41.65 | 8.50 | 56.94 | 11.62 | 900 | 183.67 |
| Yugoslavia..... | Dinar..... | 16,360 | 21.81 | 8,201 | 10.93 | 937 | 1.25 | 1,835 | 2.45 | 27,333 | 36.44 |
| Egypt..... | Egyptian pound..... | 38.26 | 91.44 | 10.48 | 25.05 | 1.73 | 4.13 | 4.53 | 10.83 | 65 | 131.45 |
| Israel..... | Israeli pound..... | 344.54 | 114.84 | 117.50 | 39.17 | 29 | 9.67 | 32.29 | 10.76 | 523.33 | 174.44 |
| Turkey..... | Turkish lira..... | 555.27 | 61.69 | 239.94 | 26.66 | 214.62 | 23.85 | 28.50 | 3.17 | 1,038.33 | 115.37 |
| Pakistan..... | Rupee..... | 91.33 | 19.35 | 107.38 | 22.75 | 9.44 | 2.00 | 25.18 | 5.33 | 233.33 | 49.44 |
| India..... | do..... | 473.27 | 100.27 | 342.20 | 72.50 | | | 44.15 | 9.35 | 859.62 | 182.12 |
| Indonesia..... | Rupiah..... | 827 | 2.33 | 1,486 | 4.19 | | | 235 | .67 | 2,548 | 7.19 |
| Hong Kong..... | Hong Kong dollar..... | 151.94 | 26.66 | 59.09 | 10.37 | 14.24 | 2.50 | 4.43 | .78 | 229.70 | 40.30 |
| Taiwan..... | New Taiwan dollar..... | 1,052 | 23.38 | 187.53 | 4.17 | | | 373.80 | 8.31 | 1,613 | 35.86 |
| Japan..... | Yen..... | 36,156 | 100.43 | 24,660 | 68.50 | 3,000 | 8.33 | 6,611 | 18.37 | 70,427 | 195.63 |
| Korea..... | Hwan..... | 23,863 | 18.36 | 16,406 | 12.62 | | | 3,900 | 3.00 | 44,169 | 33.98 |
| France (airline ticket)..... | New franc..... | | | | | 328.30 | 67.00 | | | 328.30 | 37.60 |
| Yugoslavia (airline ticket)..... | Dinar..... | | | | | 1,334,662 | 1,779.50 | | | 1,334,662 | 1,779.50 |
| India (airline ticket)..... | Rupee..... | | | | | 3,314 | 695.95 | | | 3,314 | 695.95 |
| Total..... | | | 674.39 | | 366.63 | | 2,602.68 | | 84.64 | | 3,728.34 |
| Paul J. Cotter: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain..... | Peseta..... | 3,082.25 | 51.50 | 2,214 | 36.99 | 344 | 5.75 | 209 | 3.50 | 5,850 | 97.74 |
| France..... | New franc..... | 459.75 | 93.83 | 341.63 | 69.72 | 41.65 | 8.50 | 56.94 | 11.62 | 900 | 183.67 |
| Yugoslavia..... | Dinar..... | 16,360 | 21.81 | 8,201 | 10.93 | 937 | 1.25 | 1,835 | 2.45 | 27,333 | 36.44 |
| Austria..... | Schilling..... | 563.82 | 21.69 | 123.77 | 4.76 | | | 62.40 | 2.40 | 750 | 28.85 |
| Italy..... | Lira..... | 47,360 | 75.10 | 20,309 | 32.64 | 6,531 | 10.50 | 4,074 | 6.55 | 77,625 | 124.79 |
| Greece..... | Drachma..... | 897 | 29.90 | 532 | 17.75 | 94 | 3.15 | 151 | 5.03 | 1,075 | 55.83 |
| Egypt..... | Egyptian pound..... | 38.26 | 91.44 | 10.48 | 25.05 | 1.73 | 4.13 | 4.53 | 10.83 | 65 | 131.45 |
| Israel..... | Israeli pound..... | 344.54 | 114.84 | 117.50 | 39.17 | 29 | 9.67 | 32.29 | 10.76 | 523.33 | 174.44 |
| Turkey..... | Turkish lira..... | 555.27 | 61.69 | 239.94 | 26.66 | 214.62 | 23.85 | 28.50 | 3.17 | 1,038.33 | 115.37 |
| Pakistan..... | Rupee..... | 91.33 | 19.35 | 107.38 | 22.75 | 9.44 | 2.00 | 25.18 | 5.33 | 233.33 | 49.44 |
| India..... | do..... | 473.27 | 100.27 | 342.20 | 72.50 | | | 44.15 | 9.35 | 859.62 | 182.12 |
| Indonesia..... | Rupiah..... | 827 | 2.33 | 1,486 | 4.19 | | | 235 | .67 | 2,548 | 7.19 |
| Hong Kong..... | Hong Kong dollar..... | 151.94 | 26.66 | 59.09 | 10.37 | 14.24 | 2.50 | 4.43 | .78 | 229.70 | 40.30 |
| Taiwan..... | New Taiwan dollar..... | 1,052 | 23.38 | 187.53 | 4.17 | | | 373.80 | 8.31 | 1,613 | 35.86 |
| Japan..... | Yen..... | 36,156 | 100.43 | 24,660 | 68.50 | 3,000 | 8.33 | 6,611 | 18.37 | 70,427 | 195.63 |
| Korea..... | Hwan..... | 23,863 | 18.36 | 16,406 | 12.62 | | | 3,900 | 3.00 | 44,169 | 33.98 |
| Dollar expenses in foreign countries..... | U.S. dollar..... | | | | 25.50 | | | | 30.50 | | 56.00 |
| Germany..... | Deutsche mark..... | | | | | 8,972.96 | 2,243.24 | | | 8,972.96 | 2,243.24 |
| Total..... | | | 852.58 | | 484.27 | | 2,322.87 | | 132.62 | | 3,792.34 |
| Franklin B. Dryden: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| French Oceania..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 12.21 | | 27.93 | | 2.83 | | 32.87 | | 75.84 |
| American Samoa..... | do..... | | | | | | 1.50 | | 7.83 | | 2.33 |
| Fiji Islands..... | do..... | | 3.18 | | 1.52 | | | | 7.36 | | 12.06 |
| New Guinea..... | do..... | | 9.92 | | 9.11 | | | 4.13 | 2.98 | | 33.14 |
| Indonesia..... | do..... | | 39.72 | | 27.17 | | | 4.91 | 29.49 | | 103.29 |
| Malaya..... | Malayan dollar..... | | | 232.24 | 76.48 | 93.65 | 30.84 | 12.20 | 4.05 | 338.09 | 119.37 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 21.55 | | 12.80 | | 5.54 | | 25.68 | | 65.57 |
| Cambodia..... | Rial..... | 1,128 | 32.38 | 2,819 | 80.95 | 4,235 | 121.65 | 1,365 | 39.75 | 9,547 | 274.73 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 46.12 | | 31.29 | | 2.68 | | 17.06 | | 97.15 |
| Vietnam..... | Plaster..... | 1,309 | 18.00 | 2,728 | 37.50 | 935 | 15.00 | 1,752 | 24.50 | 6,724 | 95.00 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 24.66 | | 27.39 | | 3.89 | | 14.70 | | 70.64 |
| Philippines..... | Peso..... | | | 165.44 | 41.36 | 202.76 | 50.69 | 37.44 | 9.36 | 405.64 | 101.41 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 18.85 | | 26.38 | | | | 22.91 | | 68.14 |
| Hong Kong..... | Hong Kong dollar..... | 162 | 28.80 | 449 | 78.34 | 136 | 22.67 | 204 | 34.13 | 951 | 163.94 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 53.04 | | 16.68 | | .11 | | 18.98 | | 88.81 |
| Taiwan..... | New Taiwan dollar..... | 614 | 15.38 | 736 | 18.44 | 982 | 24.59 | 736 | 18.44 | 3,068 | 76.85 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 13.75 | | 4.01 | | | | 3.74 | | 21.50 |
| Okinawa..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 1.50 | | | | | | 4.57 | | 6.07 |
| Korea..... | Hwan..... | | | 1,999 | 15.44 | 1,874 | 14.88 | 2,375 | 18.33 | 6,248 | 48.65 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 4.00 | | 2.50 | | | | 3.63 | | 10.13 |
| Japan..... | Yen..... | 19,994 | 79.54 | 26,658 | 106.05 | 34,250 | 137.91 | 7,000 | 28.37 | 87,902 | 351.87 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 40.92 | | 24.09 | | 4.49 | | 35.32 | | 104.82 |
| Total..... | | | 463.52 | | 665.43 | | 455.31 | | 397.05 | | 1,981.31 |
| Stephen Kurzman: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Germany..... | Dollar..... | | 21.70 | | 13.22 | | 41.80 | | 2.52 | | 79.24 |
| Switzerland..... | do..... | | 17.81 | | 8.66 | | 27.70 | | | | 54.17 |
| Italy..... | do..... | | 39.75 | | 32.14 | | 109.30 | | | | 181.19 |
| France..... | do..... | | 28.70 | | 30.68 | | 60.40 | | 8.19 | | 127.97 |
| Belgium..... | do..... | | 14.78 | | 3.46 | | 7.00 | | | | 25.24 |
| United States..... | do..... | | | | | | 218.00 | | | | 218.00 |
| Total..... | | | 122.74 | | 88.16 | | 464.20 | | 10.71 | | 685.81 |
| James Minotto: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| United States..... | Dollar..... | | | | 21.25 | | 99.50 | | 19.00 | | 139.75 |
| France..... | New franc..... | 1,210 | 246.00 | 713 | 145.50 | 222 | 45.00 | 260 | 53.50 | 2,405 | 490.00 |
| Belgium..... | Belgium franc..... | 2,000 | 40.00 | 1,800 | 36.00 | 900 | 18.00 | 500 | 10.00 | 5,200 | 104.00 |
| Luxembourg..... | do..... | 650 | 13.00 | 900 | 18.00 | 700 | 14.00 | 250 | 5.00 | 2,500 | 50.00 |
| Netherlands..... | Florin..... | 120 | 43.00 | 92 | 33.00 | 31 | 11.00 | 34 | 12.00 | 277 | 99.00 |
| Germany..... | Deutsche mark..... | 81 | 221.00 | 640 | 160.00 | 8,081.56 | 2,145.29 | 406 | 59.61 | 10,514.56 | 2,585.79 |
| Denmark..... | Danish kroner..... | 598 | 83.00 | 490 | 72.00 | 240 | 36.00 | 210 | 30.00 | 1,527 | 226.00 |
| Sweden..... | Swedish kroner..... | 225 | 45.00 | 225 | 45.00 | 79 | 15.00 | 65 | 13.00 | 594 | 118.00 |
| Norway..... | Norwegian kroner..... | 90 | 12.60 | 88 | 12.30 | 15 | 2.10 | 57 | 8.00 | 250 | 35.00 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| James Minotto—Continued | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Great Britain | English pound | 26-16-0 | 75.00 | 22-10-0 | 60.00 | 16-2-8 | 45.00 | 5-14-0 | 16.00 | 71-2-8 | 196.00 |
| Portugal | Escudo | 1,995 | 70.00 | 1,110 | 60.00 | 685 | 24.00 | 741 | 26.00 | 5,133 | 180.00 |
| Spain | Peseta | 1,560 | 26.00 | 1,620 | 27.00 | 1,080 | 18.00 | 1,020 | 17.00 | 5,280 | 88.00 |
| Italy | Italian lira | 187,810 | 303.00 | 137,760 | 223.00 | 145,390 | 234.50 | 58,500 | 94.50 | 529,460 | 855.00 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | | | | | 14.00 | | 4.00 | | 18.00 |
| Greece | Drachma | 2,940 | 98.00 | 2,530 | 84.00 | 1,470 | 49.00 | 1,020 | 34.00 | 7,960 | 265.00 |
| Turkey | Turkish lira | 1,026 | 113.00 | 882 | 97.00 | 492 | 54.00 | 362 | 40.00 | 2,762 | 304.00 |
| Lebanon | Lebanese pound | 216 | 70.00 | 144 | 48.00 | 75 | 25.00 | 60 | 20.00 | 495 | 163.00 |
| United Arab Republic | Egyptian pound | 21 | 48.00 | 15.60 | 36.00 | 9.50 | 21.80 | 7.90 | 18.20 | 54 | 124.00 |
| Austria | Schilling | 3,120 | 120.00 | 2,392 | 92.00 | 1,560 | 60.00 | 702 | 27.00 | 7,774 | 299.00 |
| Switzerland | Swiss franc | 297.50 | 70.00 | 195.50 | 46.00 | 85 | 19.00 | 68 | 16.00 | 646 | 151.00 |
| Yugoslavia | Dinar | 9,000 | 12.00 | 7,500 | 10.00 | 134,850 | 180.00 | 2,500 | 3.50 | 153,850 | 205.50 |
| Total | | | 1,713.60 | | 1,326.05 | | 3,130.19 | | 526.20 | | 6,696.04 |
| Mary L. Vaughan: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | Peseta | 3,082.25 | 51.50 | 2,214 | 36.99 | 344 | 5.75 | 209 | 3.50 | 5,850 | 97.74 |
| France | New franc | 459.75 | 93.83 | 341.63 | 69.72 | 41.65 | 8.50 | 56.94 | 11.62 | 900 | 183.67 |
| Yugoslavia | Dinar | 16,360 | 21.81 | 8,201 | 10.93 | 987 | 1.25 | 1,835 | 2.45 | 27,333 | 36.44 |
| Austria | Schilling | 563.82 | 21.69 | 123.77 | 4.76 | | | 62.40 | 2.40 | 750 | 28.85 |
| Italy | Lira | 47,360 | 75.10 | 20,309 | 32.64 | 6,531 | 10.50 | 4,074 | 6.55 | 77,625 | 124.79 |
| Greece | Drachma | 897 | 29.90 | 532 | 17.75 | 94 | 3.15 | 151 | 5.03 | 1,675 | 55.83 |
| Egypt | Egyptian pound | 38.26 | 91.44 | 10.48 | 25.05 | 1.73 | 4.13 | 4.53 | 10.83 | 55 | 131.45 |
| Israel | Israeli pound | 344.54 | 114.84 | 117.50 | 39.17 | 29 | 9.67 | 32.29 | 10.76 | 523.33 | 174.44 |
| Turkey | Turkish lira | 555.27 | 61.69 | 239.94 | 26.66 | 214.62 | 23.85 | 28.50 | 3.17 | 1,038.33 | 115.37 |
| Pakistan | Rupee | 91.33 | 19.35 | 107.38 | 22.75 | 9.44 | 2.00 | 25.18 | 5.33 | 233.33 | 49.44 |
| India | do | 473.27 | 100.27 | 342.20 | 72.50 | | | 44.15 | 9.35 | 859.62 | 182.12 |
| Indonesia | Rupiah | 827 | 2.33 | 1,486 | 4.19 | | | 235 | .67 | 2,548 | 7.19 |
| Hong Kong | Hong Kong dollar | 151.94 | 26.66 | 89.09 | 10.37 | 14.24 | 2.50 | 4.43 | .78 | 229.70 | 40.30 |
| Taiwan | New Taiwan dollar | 1,052 | 23.38 | 187.53 | 4.17 | | | 373.80 | 8.31 | 1,613 | 35.86 |
| Japan | Yen | 36,156 | 100.43 | 24,660 | 68.50 | 3,000 | 8.33 | 6,611 | 18.37 | 70,427 | 195.63 |
| Korea | Hwan | 23,863 | 18.36 | 16,406 | 12.62 | | | 3,900 | 3.00 | 44,169 | 33.98 |
| Dollar expenses in foreign countries | U.S. dollar | | | | 25.50 | | | | 30.50 | | 56.00 |
| Germany (airline ticket) | Deutsche mark | | | | | 8,972.96 | 2,243.24 | | | 8,972.96 | 2,243.24 |
| Total | | | 852.58 | | 484.27 | | 2,322.87 | | 132.62 | | 3,792.34 |
| Group expenses: † | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Malaya | Malayan dollar | | | 67.40 | 21.90 | | | | | 67.40 | 21.90 |
| Cambodia | Rial | 1,820 | 52.00 | 5,705 | 163.20 | 4,305 | 123.41 | 1,404 | 41.39 | 13,234 | 380.00 |
| Vietnam | Piaster | 1,952 | 24.00 | 12,817 | 168.15 | 743 | 10.60 | 3,160 | 42.75 | 18,672 | 245.50 |
| Philippines | Peso | 137.85 | 36.00 | 987.20 | 259.30 | 133.80 | 33.70 | 1,321.96 | 342.99 | 2,580.81 | 671.99 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 12.00 | | 28.00 | | | | | | 40.00 |
| Hong Kong | Hong Kong dollar | 412 | 67.40 | 1,773 | 290.54 | 224 | 37.28 | 1,580 | 259.58 | 3,989 | 654.80 |
| Japan | Yen | 10,261 | 41.60 | 31,258 | 125.10 | 17,250 | 68.90 | 49,196 | 194.40 | 107,965 | 430.00 |
| Total | | | 233.00 | | 1,056.19 | | 273.89 | | 881.11 | | 2,444.19 |

1 Includes lodging, meals, miscellaneous and transportation.

2 Transportation.

3 Transportation: Paris to Belgrade.

4 Transportation: Yugoslavia to Indonesia, via United Arab Republic, Israel, Turkey, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, and return to Frankfurt, Germany.

5 Difference in ticket cost to permit travel from Indonesia to Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Korea, and return to Frankfurt, Germany, via Washington, D.C.

6 Of which 7,669.56 deutsche marks for airline tickets for 2 trips.

7 Airline tickets.

8 Represents group expenses of trip of Senators McGee, Church, Moss, staff member Franklin B. Dryden, and departmental escort officers.

RECAPITULATION

| Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) | Amount |
|---|-----------|
| Appropriated funds: | 28,312.46 |
| Government department: | |
| Department of Defense | 4,989.26 |
| Department of State | 1,245.69 |
| Total | 34,547.32 |

MAR. 11, 1963.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union, Rome, Italy, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Jennings Randolph: Italy | U.S. dollar | | 113.00 | | 37.67 | | 655.24 | | 47.48 | | 853.39 |
| Gordon Allott: Italy | do | | 13.33 | | 8.00 | | | | 23.20 | | 44.53 |
| Geo. B. Galloway: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | do | | 86.50 | | 119.99 | | 677.22 | | 79.90 | | 963.61 |
| England | do | | 10.00 | | 3.50 | | | | | | 13.50 |
| Total | | | 222.83 | | 169.16 | | 1,332.46 | | 150.58 | | 1,875.03 |

RECAPITULATION

| Appropriated funds: Other (22 U.S.C. 276a) | Amount |
|--|------------|
| | \$1,875.03 |

MAR. 13, 1963.

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Senate delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group Conference, May 14-24, 1962, Washington, D.C., New York, and Los Angeles, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Clair Engle: United States | U.S. dollar | | 65.65 | | | | 323.49 | | | | 389.14 |
| Thomas Kuchel: United States | do. | | 178.85 | | | | | | | | 178.85 |
| Delegation staff: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Joe Gonzales: United States | do. | | 124.41 | | 33.15 | | 214.60 | | 6.55 | | 378.71 |
| Milrae Jensen: United States | do. | | 166.75 | | 21.40 | | 226.35 | | 52.90 | | 467.40 |
| Arthur Kuhl: United States | do. | | 199.52 | | | | 1,388.20 | | 20.00 | | 467.72 |
| Delegation expenses | do. | | 280.38 | | | | | | 180.00 | | 460.38 |
| Durrell St. Claire: United States | do. | | 203.62 | | 43.70 | | 265.70 | | 55.21 | | 568.23 |
| Delegation expenses | do. | | 366.67 | | 4,231.84 | | 876.68 | | 3,751.03 | | 9,225.22 |
| Total | | | 1,585.85 | | 4,330.09 | | 2,294.02 | | 4,065.62 | | 12,275.65 |

¹ \$43.12 of this amount rebated and placed on deposit to Mexico-United States accounts. ² \$33.33 of this amount rebated and deposited to Mexico-United States accounts.

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420..... Amount \$12,275.65

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAR. 14, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 6th meeting of Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, Canada, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| George Alken: Canada | U.S. dollar | | 40.85 | | 1.85 | | | | | | 42.70 |
| Maurine Neuberger: Canada | do. | | 39.00 | | 3.85 | | | | .90 | | 43.75 |
| Clairborne Pell: Canada | do. | | 58.00 | | 13.21 | | | | 36.53 | | 107.74 |
| Roman Hruska: Canada | do. | | 71.50 | | 7.75 | | | | 7.72 | | 86.97 |
| Pat McNamara: Canada | do. | | 52.50 | | 10.71 | | | | | | 63.21 |
| Delegation staff: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lola Pierotti | do. | | 33.00 | | 1.35 | | | | .15 | | 34.50 |
| John Newhouse | do. | | 30.00 | | 25.12 | | | | 5.25 | | 60.37 |
| Milrae Jensen | do. | | 48.00 | | 21.66 | | 2.30 | | 7.65 | | 79.61 |
| Delegation Expenses: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baggage handling | | | | | | | | | 27.50 | | 27.50 |
| Food en route and official reception | | | | | 230.50 | | | | | | 230.50 |
| Total | | | 372.85 | | 316.00 | | 2.30 | | 85.70 | | 776.85 |

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Other (Public Law 86-42)..... Amount 776.85

Total..... 776.85

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Senate Delegation.

MAR. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, United States, British, and Canada, Parliamentary Conference, Bermuda, British West Indies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|---|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| John Sparkman: Bermuda | Pound | | | 42-12 | 120.55 | 1 | 2.83 | | | 43-12 | 123.38 |
| Clairborne Pell: Bermuda | Deutsche mark | | | | | 246.76 | 62.00 | | | 246.76 | 62.00 |
| Carl Marcy: Bermuda | do. | 27-6-6 | 77.10 | 35 | 99.05 | | | | | 62-6-6 | 176.15 |
| Darrell St. Claire: Bermuda | do. | 40-13-3 | 114.80 | 100 | 283.00 | | | | | 143-17-1 | 406.80 |
| | do. | 20-4-6 | 57.03 | 19-4 | 54.14 | | | | | 39-8-6 | 111.17 |
| | U.S. dollars | | | | 76.00 | | 9.00 | | 15.00 | | 100.00 |
| Delegation costs: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Official receptions, luncheons, rentals | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taxis, tips | | | | 51-4-3 | 144.42 | | | 2 | 5.66 | 53-4-3 | 150.08 |
| Gratuities, airport and baggage costs | | | | | | 3-7-11 | 9.58 | | | 3-7-11 | 9.58 |
| | | | | | | | | 25-5 | 71.20 | 52-5 | 71.20 |
| Total | | | 248.93 | | 777.16 | | 83.41 | | 100.86 | | 1,210.36 |

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 1,110.36
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 246 (87th Cong. 2d session)..... 100.00

Total..... 1,210.36

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAR. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Fulbright, J. W.: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| France | U.S. dollar | | 113.88 | | 196.08 | | 26.50 | | 48.81 | | 385.27 |
| Netherlands | Guilder | | | | | 11,335 | 371.60 | | | | 371.60 |
| Byrd, Harry F.: France | U.S. dollar | | 89.45 | | 25.34 | | | | 15.00 | | 129.79 |
| Kefauver, Estes: France | do. | | 128.69 | | 242.29 | | 20.00 | | 43.92 | | 434.90 |
| Smathers, George A.: France | do. | | 68.33 | | 72.11 | | 10.50 | | 20.20 | | 171.14 |
| Randolph, Jennings: France | do. | | 122.07 | | 111.81 | | 39.50 | | 15.72 | | 289.10 |
| Cannon, Howard: France | do. | | 125.69 | | 174.66 | | 19.97 | | 39.62 | | 359.94 |
| McCarthy, Eugene J.: France | do. | | 134.96 | | 197.71 | | 40.00 | | 68.63 | | 441.30 |
| Capchard, Homer: France | do. | | 126.53 | | 191.06 | | 45.00 | | 111.86 | | 474.45 |
| Hickenlooper, Bourke B.: France | do. | | 20.24 | | 30.50 | | 5.50 | | 14.00 | | 70.24 |
| Mundt, Karl E.: France | do. | | 121.46 | | 116.42 | | 202.23 | | 26.52 | | 466.63 |
| Kuchel, Thomas H.: France | do. | | 166.81 | | 157.63 | | 22.00 | | 30.97 | | 377.41 |
| Cooper, John Sherman: France | do. | | 130.71 | | 68.91 | | | | | | 199.62 |
| Javits, Jacob K.: France | do. | | 270.01 | | 109.35 | | 43.79 | | 63.89 | | 487.04 |
| Marcy, Carl: France | do. | | 81.56 | | 139.83 | | 25.50 | | 105.57 | | 352.46 |
| Tillman, Seth: France | do. | | 60.73 | | 105.94 | | 21.80 | | 28.07 | | 216.54 |
| Jensen, Milrae E.: France | do. | | 122.42 | | 75.02 | | 86.65 | | 10.82 | | 294.91 |
| Saffer, Penelope: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| France | do. | | | | | | 12.46 | | | | |
| Netherlands | Guilder | | 60.73 | | 57.90 | 1,040.80 | 289.50 | | 11.81 | | 432.40 |
| Drakert, Marcello: France | U.S. dollar | | 131.60 | | 163.30 | | 18.50 | | 29.19 | | 342.59 |
| Conlon, Jack: France | do. | | 60.73 | | 182.85 | | 45.00 | | 96.57 | | 385.15 |
| Blitz, Herbert: France | do. | | 138.32 | | 149.82 | | 88.00 | | 32.76 | | 408.90 |
| Delegation expenses: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Official luncheons and receptions, France | do. | | | | 246.51 | | | | | | 246.51 |
| Office and conference room rental and supplies, France | do. | | | | | | | | 678.14 | | 678.14 |
| Gratuities, France | do. | | | | | | | | 51.02 | | 51.02 |
| Transportation, France | do. | | | | | | 94.36 | | | | 94.36 |
| Overtime for Embassy personnel, France | do. | | | | | | | | 233.47 | | 233.47 |
| Total | | | 2,274.92 | | 2,815.04 | | 1,528.36 | | 1,776.56 | | 8,394.88 |

RECAPITULATION

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) | 661.10 | Amount |
| Appropriated funds: Public Law 84-689 | 7,733.78 | |
| Total | 8,394.88 | |

J. W. FULBRIGHT,

Chairman, U.S. Senate Delegation, Eighth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

MAR. 11, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation to attend 8th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Harrison A. Williams, Jr.: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nigeria | U.S. dollar | | | | 39.00 | | | | 9.00 | | 48.00 |
| Turkey | Lira | 195.50 | 21.72 | 162.50 | 18.06 | | | 109.50 | 21.16 | 467.50 | 60.94 |
| Greece | Drachma | 422 | 14.07 | 472 | 15.73 | | | 192 | 6.40 | 1,086 | 36.20 |
| Denmark | Kroner | 220 | 31.88 | 134.55 | 19.49 | | | 46.95 | 6.80 | 401.50 | 58.17 |
| Germany | Deutsche mark | | | 64 | 16.00 | | | | | 64 | 16.00 |
| Do. | do. | | 4.00 | | 1.70 | | | | 10.50 | | 16.20 |
| United States | U.S. dollar | | | | | | 42.50 | | 14.00 | | 56.50 |
| Quentin N. Burdick: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nigeria | do. | | | | 35.00 | | | | 13.00 | | 48.00 |
| Do. | Pound | | | 2 | 5.60 | 3 | 8.40 | | | 5 | 14.00 |
| Turkey | Lira | 195.50 | 21.72 | 167 | 16.33 | | | 93.65 | 10.41 | 456.15 | 48.46 |
| Greece | Drachma | 422 | 14.07 | 444 | 14.80 | | | 423 | 14.10 | 1,289 | 42.97 |
| Denmark | Kroner | 220 | 31.88 | 176.40 | 25.57 | | | | | 396.40 | 57.45 |
| Germany | Deutsche mark | | | 64 | 16.00 | | | | | 64 | 16.00 |
| Do. | do. | | 4.00 | | | | 4.40 | | 6.00 | | 14.40 |
| United States | U.S. dollar | | | | | | 183.26 | | 8.00 | | 191.26 |
| Wallace B. Edgerton: Nigeria | Pound | | | 4-15 | 13.30 | | | 3-10 | 9.80 | 8-5 | 23.10 |
| Do. | U.S. dollar | | | | 14.00 | | | | 2.00 | | 16.00 |
| Turkey | Lira | 161 | 17.88 | 156 | 17.33 | | | 112.90 | 12.54 | 429.90 | 47.75 |
| Greece | Drachma | 272 | 9.07 | 183 | 6.10 | | | 40 | 1.34 | 495 | 16.51 |
| Denmark | Kroner | 150 | 21.74 | 130.95 | 18.82 | | | 27.45 | 3.98 | 308.40 | 44.54 |
| Germany | Deutsche mark | | | 63 | 15.75 | | | 17 | 4.25 | 80.00 | 20.00 |
| Do. | U.S. dollar | | 4.00 | | 8.50 | | | | | | 12.50 |
| United States | do. | | | | | | 4.40 | | 12.50 | | 16.90 |
| Arthur M. Kuhl: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nigeria | do. | | | | 16.00 | | | | | | 16.00 |
| Turkey | Lira | 161 | 17.88 | 145 | 16.11 | | | 62.35 | 6.91 | 368.35 | 40.90 |
| Greece | Drachma | 272 | 9.07 | 216 | 7.19 | | | | | 488 | 16.26 |
| Denmark | Kroner | 150 | 21.74 | 142 | 20.58 | | | 121.30 | 17.54 | 413.30 | 59.86 |
| Germany | Deutsche mark | | | 78 | 19.50 | | | 11 | 2.75 | 89 | 22.25 |
| Do. | U.S. dollar | | 4.00 | | 1.30 | | | | 4.70 | | 10.00 |
| United States | do. | | | | | | 5.20 | | 53.35 | | 58.55 |
| Delegation expenses: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ambassador's reception, Nigeria | Pound | | | 75 | 210.00 | | | | | 75 | 210.00 |
| Official meals, Nigeria | do. | | | 14 | 39.20 | | | | | 14 | 39.20 |
| Transportation, Nigeria | do. | | | | | 3 | 8.40 | | | 3 | 8.40 |

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation to attend 8th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Gratuities, Nigeria | do | | | | | | | 4 | 11.20 | 4 | 11.20 |
| Consulgeneral's reception, Turkey | Lira | | | 782.42 | 86.93 | | | | | 782.42 | 86.93 |
| Official meals, Turkey | do | | | 608 | 67.55 | | | | | 608 | 67.55 |
| Transportation, Turkey | do | | | | | 111 | 12.33 | | | 111 | 12.33 |
| Gratuities, Turkey | do | | | | | | | 100 | 11.11 | 100 | 11.11 |
| Postage, Turkey | do | | | | | | | 56 | 6.23 | 56 | 6.23 |
| Communications, Turkey | do | | | | | | | 882 | 99.12 | 882 | 99.12 |
| Ambassador's reception, Greece | Drachma | | | 1,050 | 35.00 | | | | | 1,050 | 35.00 |
| Conference room rental, Greece | do | | | | | | | 1,338 | 44.60 | 1,338 | 44.60 |
| Overtime, Embassy drivers, Greece | do | | | | | 3,000 | 100.00 | | | 3,000 | 100.00 |
| Official meals, Greece | do | | | 3,196 | 106.37 | | | | | 3,196 | 106.37 |
| Communications, Greece | do | | | | | | | 2,268 | 75.60 | 2,268 | 75.60 |
| Gratuities, Greece | do | | | | | | | 450 | 15.00 | 450 | 15.00 |
| Postage, Greece | do | | | | | | | 90 | 3.00 | 90 | 3.00 |
| Official meals, Denmark | Kroner | | | 449.26 | 65.11 | | | | | 449.26 | 65.11 |
| Communications, Denmark | do | | | | | | | 542.65 | 78.55 | 542.65 | 78.55 |
| Transportation, Denmark | do | | | | | 199.65 | 28.93 | | | 199.65 | 28.93 |
| Gratuities, Denmark | do | | | | | | | 120 | 17.39 | 120 | 17.39 |
| Official meals, Germany | Deutsche mark | | | 251.92 | 62.98 | | | | | 251.92 | 62.98 |
| Communications, Germany | do | | | | | | | 230 | 57.60 | 230 | 57.60 |
| Transportation, Germany | do | | | | | 90 | 23.00 | | | 90 | 23.00 |
| Gratuities, Germany | do | | | | | | | 45 | 11.25 | 45 | 11.25 |
| Total | | | 248.72 | | 1,070.90 | | 420.82 | | 681.68 | | 2,422.12 |

RECAPITULATION

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) | Amount |
| Appropriated funds: | 1,917.81 |
| S. Res. 379 (87th Cong.) | 504.31 |
| Government Department (Identify each): Department of Navy | 531.89 |
| Total | 2,954.01 |

J. W. FULBRIGHT,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAR. 14, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Senate delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Brasilia, Brazil, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| A. Willis Robertson: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | U.S. dollar | | 33.62 | | 39.35 | | | | 3.08 | | 76.05 |
| Peru | do | | 24.19 | | 49.48 | | | | | | 73.67 |
| Argentina | do | | 30.06 | | 22.55 | | | | .14 | | 52.75 |
| Brazil | do | | 116.11 | | 169.20 | | 3.22 | | 53.82 | | 342.35 |
| Trinidad | do | | 10.53 | | | | | | 1.60 | | 12.13 |
| Herman Talmadge: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | 48.03 | | 9.16 | | | | 5.60 | | 62.79 |
| Peru | do | | 29.20 | | 8.00 | | | | | | 37.20 |
| Argentina | do | | 35.07 | | 37.25 | | | | 19.16 | | 91.48 |
| Brazil | do | | 96.38 | | 128.63 | | 1.77 | | 23.42 | | 250.20 |
| Trinidad | do | | 16.05 | | 30.36 | | | | 1.60 | | 48.01 |
| Strom Thurmond: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | do | | 58.06 | | 25.01 | | | | 12.70 | | 95.77 |
| Trinidad | do | | 11.03 | | | | | | 1.10 | | 12.13 |
| Oren Long: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | 39.63 | | 30.80 | | | | .24 | | 70.67 |
| Peru | do | | 35.38 | | 29.69 | | | | 1.26 | | 64.98 |
| Argentina | do | | 35.07 | | 13.53 | | | | | | 49.86 |
| Brazil | do | | 96.38 | | 109.11 | | | | 46.77 | | 252.26 |
| Trinidad | do | | 16.05 | | | | | | 1.60 | | 17.65 |
| Maurice J. Murphy, Jr.: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | 48.03 | | 41.27 | | | | 50.11 | | 139.41 |
| Peru | do | | 28.33 | | 42.20 | | | | 12.00 | | 82.53 |
| Argentina | do | | 35.07 | | 55.51 | | | | 9.01 | | 99.59 |
| Brazil | do | | 96.38 | | 216.62 | | 3.22 | | 89.58 | | 405.80 |
| Trinidad | do | | 16.05 | | 3.96 | | | | 1.60 | | 21.61 |
| Ralph Yarborough: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | 48.03 | | 15.13 | | | | 21.84 | | 85.00 |
| Peru | do | | 29.30 | | 40.00 | | 1.80 | | 28.00 | | 99.10 |
| Argentina | do | | 35.07 | | 72.02 | | 4.39 | | 39.61 | | 151.09 |
| Brazil | do | | 101.60 | | 175.37 | | 10.23 | | 146.99 | | 434.19 |
| Trinidad | do | | 16.04 | | 11.07 | | | | 1.60 | | 28.71 |
| George B. Galloway: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | 48.03 | | 49.93 | | 1.70 | | 6.00 | | 105.66 |
| Peru | do | | 42.07 | | 54.20 | | | | 3.00 | | 99.27 |
| Argentina | do | | 35.07 | | 69.73 | | 2.80 | | 7.46 | | 115.06 |
| Brazil | do | | 97.62 | | 151.75 | | 1.61 | | 24.56 | | 275.54 |
| Trinidad | do | | 16.05 | | 12.50 | | | | 1.60 | | 30.15 |
| Elizabeth Bond: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | 42.03 | | 9.97 | | | | .08 | | 52.08 |
| Peru | do | | 20.13 | | 13.92 | | | | | | 34.05 |
| Argentina | do | | 31.15 | | 3.60 | | | | .03 | | 34.78 |
| Brazil | do | | 71.10 | | 88.91 | | 10.24 | | 28.04 | | 198.29 |
| Trinidad | do | | 11.03 | | .80 | | | | 1.21 | | 13.04 |

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Senate delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Brasilia, Brazil, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Eleanor Thurmond: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | 42.03 | | | | | | .12 | | 42.15 |
| Peru | do | | 20.16 | | | | | | | | 20.16 |
| Argentina | do | | 30.06 | | 4.71 | | | | .11 | | 34.88 |
| Brazil | do | | 71.10 | | 9.38 | | | | 5.61 | | 86.09 |
| Trinidad | do | | 11.03 | | | | | | 1.10 | | 12.13 |
| Pat M. Holt: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | do | | | | | | 7.08 | | 8.48 | | 15.56 |
| Do | Peso | 525 | 42.03 | 2,049 | 164.04 | 116 | 9.28 | 54.75 | 4.22 | 2,744.75 | 219.57 |
| Peru | U.S. dollar | | 24.10 | 1,585 | 63.40 | 50 | 2.00 | 25 | 12.50 | | 14.50 |
| Do | Sol. | 602.60 | | | 9.89 | | 7.00 | | 10.00 | 2,262.60 | 99.50 |
| Argentina | U.S. dollar | | 30.06 | 23,387.30 | 171.25 | 7,500 | 54.94 | 5,342 | 39.12 | 40,333.30 | 295.37 |
| Do | Peso | 4,104 | | | 11.00 | | 13.30 | | 24.75 | | 49.05 |
| Brazil | U.S. dollar | | 46,950 | 75.72 | 91,407.50 | 147.42 | 11,830 | 19.08 | 31.00 | 169,409.50 | 1,273.22 |
| Do | Cruzeiro | | | | 11.95 | | 2.84 | | 1.10 | | 26.92 |
| Trinidad | U.S. dollar | | | | | | | | | | |
| Darrell St. Claire: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | U.S. dollar | | | | | | | | 15.25 | | 15.25 |
| Do | Peso | 525 | 42.03 | 239.50 | 19.16 | | | | .08 | 765.50 | 61.27 |
| Peru | U.S. dollar | | | | | | | | 8.00 | | 8.00 |
| Do | Sol. | 472.10 | 18.88 | | | | | | | 472.10 | 18.88 |
| Argentina | Peso | 4,104 | 30.06 | 4,937.50 | 36.16 | | | 276 | 2.02 | 9,317.50 | 68.24 |
| Brazil | U.S. dollar | | | | | | | | 12.45 | | 12.45 |
| Do | Cruzeiro | 46,950 | 81.86 | 60,326.40 | 115.26 | 1,900 | 3.72 | 42,531 | 84.06 | 151,707.40 | 284.90 |
| Trinidad | U.S. dollar | | 11.03 | | 8.79 | | | | 5.55 | | 25.37 |
| United States | do | | | | | | 9.00 | | | | 9.00 |
| Delegation expenses: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mexico | Peso | | | 3,710 | 296.97 | 837.50 | 67.05 | 6,471.50 | 518.13 | | 11,019 |
| Peru | Sol. | | | 4,064.57 | 151.39 | 2,474 | 810.25 | 30.23 | 7,348.82 | | 272.93 |
| Argentina | Peso | | | 106,868.55 | 782.00 | 8,500 | 62.24 | 12,862.30 | 94.22 | 128,230.85 | 938.46 |
| Brazil | U.S. dollar | | | | 2,323.76 | | 1,569.35 | 125.80 | | | 4,018.91 |
| Do | Cruzeiro | 2,500 | 5.43 | 261,215 | 570.03 | 90,714 | 197.20 | 511,373.40 | 1,111.68 | 1,018,509.40 | 1,884.34 |
| Trinidad | U.S. dollar | | | | 42.96 | | | | | | 42.96 |
| Total | | | 2,145.54 | | 6,770.10 | | 2,159.37 | | 2,807.99 | | 13,883.00 |

1 \$20 of this sum rebated to the U.S. Treasury.

RECAPITULATION

| | | |
|---|-----------|--------|
| Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) | 5,299.83 | Amount |
| Appropriated funds: 22 U.S.C. 276a | 8,583.17 | |
| Total | 13,883.00 | |

MAR. 14, 1963.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Interparliamentary Union Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|--|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| J. W. Fulbright: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Germany | Deutsche mark | | | | | | | 50.00 | 12.50 | 50.00 | 12.50 |
| Italy | Lira | 27,000.00 | 43.20 | 55,000.00 | 88.00 | 1,000.00 | 1.60 | 7,000.00 | 11.20 | 90,000.00 | 144.00 |
| Homer E. Capelhart: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| France | Franc | 276.20 | 56.38 | 260.50 | 53.15 | 3,435.88 | 701.20 | 170.00 | 34.60 | 4,142.58 | 845.33 |
| Italy | Lira | 51,762.00 | 83.49 | 80,243.00 | 129.41 | 31,000.00 | 50.00 | 25,946.00 | 41.85 | 188,951.00 | 304.75 |
| Bourke B. Hickenlooper: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uruguay | Peso | | | 266 | 24.17 | 99 | 9.00 | 50 | 4.55 | 415 | 37.72 |
| France | U.S. dollar | | 20.24 | | 30.50 | | 5.50 | | 14.00 | | 70.24 |
| Wayne Morse: Uruguay | Peso | | | 1,055 | 91.78 | 260 | 23.74 | 703 | 64.20 | 1,968 | 179.72 |
| Bourke B. Hickenlooper:¹ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | Drachma | 2,000 | 66.66 | 853 | 28.44 | | | | | 2,853 | 95.10 |
| Turkey | Pound | 950 | 105.55 | 300 | 33.00 | | | 120 | 13.33 | 1,370 | 151.88 |
| Egypt | do | 36.9 | 85.00 | 14.9 | 34.00 | | | 3.5 | 8.10 | 57 | 127.10 |
| Lebanon | do | | | | | 332.50 | 110.50 | | | 332.50 | 110.50 |
| Pakistan | Rupee | | | | | 210 | 44.53 | | | 210 | 44.53 |
| India | do | 500 | 100.00 | 220 | 44.40 | 200 | 40.00 | 80.35 | 16.00 | 1,000.35 | 200.40 |
| Burma | Kyat | | | | | | | 171 | 36.30 | 171 | 36.30 |
| Thailand | Baht | 2,800 | 135.60 | 1,800 | 87.10 | | | 1,595 | 77.00 | 6,195 | 259.70 |
| Hong Kong | Dollar | 1,918 | 336.50 | 970 | 170.20 | 114 | 20.00 | 998 | 175.00 | 4,000 | 701.70 |
| Japan | Yen | 60,000 | 166.66 | 25,000 | 69.40 | | | | | 85,000 | 236.06 |
| Netherlands | Guilder | | | | | 6,568 | 1,827.64 | | | | 1,827.64 |
| Frank Church: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| French Oceania | Dollar | | 17.44 | | 13.75 | | 7.52 | | 36.61 | | 75.32 |
| American Samoa | do | | | | | | 1.50 | | 1.66 | | 3.16 |
| Fiji Islands | do | | 3.18 | | 4.06 | | | | 9.38 | | 16.62 |
| New Guinea | do | | 11.17 | | 9.11 | | 11.13 | | 3.68 | | 35.09 |
| Indonesia | do | | 39.72 | | 21.21 | | 4.91 | | 36.74 | | 102.58 |
| Malaya | Malaya dollar | | | 172.79 | 56.91 | 66.41 | 21.89 | 26.58 | 8.76 | 265.83 | 87.56 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 21.33 | | 14.66 | | 5.56 | | 29.72 | | 71.27 |
| Cambodia | Rial | 980 | 27.58 | 2,660 | 75.85 | 4,805 | 137.91 | 1,155 | 33.43 | 9,600 | 274.77 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 21.35 | | 29.92 | | 2.68 | | 17.06 | | 71.01 |
| Vietnam | Piastre | 2,291 | 31.50 | 3,437 | 47.25 | 3,139 | 43.25 | 349 | 13.00 | 9,216 | 135.00 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 24.66 | | 1.58 | | | | 26.43 | | 52.67 |
| Philippines | Peso | | | 136.60 | 34.85 | 168.10 | 42.43 | 72.12 | 18.80 | 376.82 | 96.08 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 22.00 | | 18.17 | | .75 | | 34.62 | | 75.54 |
| Hong Kong | Hong Kong dollar | 205 | 35.89 | 463 | 80.76 | 169 | 28.79 | 78 | 13.65 | 915 | 159.09 |
| Do | U.S. dollar | | 29.46 | | 23.86 | | .11 | | 17.98 | | 71.41 |

¹\$435 of Senator Hickenlooper's total rebated to the U.S. Treasury on account of personal expenses.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

| Name and country | Name of currency | Lodging | | Meals | | Transportation | | Miscellaneous | | Total | |
|---|------------------------|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Frank Church—Continued | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taiwan..... | New Taiwan dollar..... | 560 | 14.02 | 560 | 14.02 | 827 | 20.72 | 486 | 12.19 | 2,433 | 60.95 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 17.50 | | 4.39 | | | | 3.74 | | 25.63 |
| Okinawa..... | do..... | | 1.50 | | 4.57 | | | | 11.18 | | 17.25 |
| Korea..... | Won..... | | | 2,306 | 17.81 | 21,147 | 16.58 | 3,499 | 27.02 | 7,952 | 61.41 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 4.00 | | 2.65 | | | | 3.33 | | 9.98 |
| Japan..... | Yen..... | 21,984 | 87.45 | 21,983 | 87.46 | 34,750 | 139.51 | 8,750 | 35.85 | 87,467 | 350.28 |
| Do..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 40.92 | | 21.31 | | 1.40 | | 11.05 | | 74.68 |
| Carl Marcy: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Netherlands..... | Guilder..... | | | | | 6,568 | 1,827.64 | | | 6,568 | 1,827.64 |
| Egypt..... | Pound..... | 40 | 92.00 | 23 | 52.90 | | | 12 | 27.00 | 75 | 172.50 |
| Lebanon..... | do..... | | | | | 332.50 | 110.50 | | | 332.50 | 110.50 |
| Pakistan..... | Rupee..... | | | | | 210 | 44.53 | | | 210 | 44.53 |
| India..... | do..... | 275 | 55.00 | 195 | 37.00 | 266 | 53.20 | | 33 | 6.60 | 151.80 |
| Burma..... | Kyat..... | | | 100 | 21.23 | | | | 111 | 23.50 | 44.73 |
| Thailand..... | Baht..... | 2,700 | 130.75 | 2,400 | 116.22 | 2,255 | 152.22 | 2,595 | 125.13 | 9,950 | 524.32 |
| Hong Kong..... | Yen..... | 1,079 | 190.52 | | | | | | | 1,079 | 190.52 |
| Japan..... | Yen..... | 27,754 | 77.09 | 21,246 | 59.01 | | | | 6.24 | 51,246 | 142.34 |
| Henry F. Holthusen: The Netherlands..... | Guilder..... | | | | | 7,281.02 | 2,025.88 | | | 7,281.02 | 2,025.88 |
| Pat M. Holt: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uruguay..... | Peso..... | 1,500 | 136.98 | 1,841 | 168.12 | 994 | 90.77 | 665 | 60.73 | 5,000 | 456.60 |
| Peru..... | Sole..... | 193.60 | 7.01 | 300 | 10.86 | 170 | 6.15 | 136.40 | 4.94 | 800 | 28.96 |
| Colombia..... | Peso..... | | | | | 7,918 | 934.94 | | | 7,918 | 934.94 |
| Mexico..... | do..... | 400 | 32.00 | 721 | 57.68 | 41.30 | 3.30 | 366.70 | 29.34 | 1,529 | 122.32 |
| The Virgin Islands, Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, and the United States..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 129.32 | | 166.84 | | 61.38 | | 52.57 | | 410.11 |
| Seth Tillman: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Germany..... | Deutsche mark..... | | | | | | | 244 | 61.00 | 244 | 61.00 |
| Italy..... | Lira..... | 37,200 | 60.00 | 38,000 | 61.29 | 2,000 | 3.22 | 12,800 | 20.64 | 90,000 | 145.15 |
| U.S. dollar..... | do..... | | | | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 |
| Austria..... | Schilling..... | 706.55 | 28.26 | 900.45 | 36.01 | 293 | 11.72 | | | 1,900 | 75.99 |
| U.S.S.R..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 48.78 | | 80.50 | | 59.72 | | | | 189.00 |
| Poland..... | Zloty..... | 402 | 16.99 | 375 | 15.38 | | | | | 777 | 32.37 |
| Hungary..... | U.S. dollar..... | | 7.50 | | 24.15 | | | | 11.75 | | 43.40 |
| United Kingdom..... | Pound..... | 3-8-9 | 9.62 | 8-11-3 | 23.97 | | | | | 12 | 33.59 |
| Netherlands..... | U.S. dollar..... | | | | | 2,058.97 | 572.89 | | 2.00 | 2,058.97 | 572.89 |
| Washington, D.C., to New York, and en route..... | Guilder..... | | 49.00 | | 31.50 | | 7.90 | | 3.50 | | 84.00 |
| Do..... | do..... | | | | | | | | 24.60 | | 32.50 |
| Total..... | | | 2,720.77 | | 2,430.36 | | 9,298.31 | | 1,374.66 | | 15,824.10 |

RECAPITULATION

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... | Amount |
| Department of Defense..... | 15,824.10 |
| Total..... | 16,526.31 |

J. W. FULBRIGHT,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAR. 14, 1963.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Joao Andre Senos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat wholesale distributors of automobile glass as manufacturers for purposes of the tax on automobile parts and accessories; and

S. 1104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1105. A bill for the relief of the Kauders-Steuber Co., and Max N. Tobias and the Max N. Tobias Bag Co., Inc.; and

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Juan Peralta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the second above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1107. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies

from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; and

S. 1108. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 1109. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending three marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1110. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Nicola Tamborra; and

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Stamatis Zeris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1115. A bill to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF HEARING ON "SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS," 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business one thousand additional copies of its hearings of August 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11, 1961, Eighty-seventh Congress, entitled "Space Satellite Communications".

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, A REPORT ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS 1963, BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "A Report on the Alliance for Progress 1963", submitted by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations and that seven thousand additional copies be printed for the use of those committees.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN NOMINEES FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 114) relating to qualifications of certain nominees for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1105 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 115); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1105) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Kauders-Steuber Company, and Max N. Tobias and the Max N. Tobias Bag Company, Incorporated", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT ON MARKET PROFITS REALIZED BY INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1104) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanation presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT PROVIDING CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT ON MARKET PROFITS REALIZED BY INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS

The bill eliminates the required accrual of market discount on municipal bonds purchased at less than par value by small mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies. For tax years after December 31, 1962, these taxpayers alone are required to accrue yearly a ratable portion of the difference between the cost of a bond and its par value under sections 818(b)(1) and 822(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The enactment of the Revenue Act of 1962 gave mutual fire and casualty insurance companies having gross income in excess of \$500,000 capital gains treatment on market profits realized from discount on both taxable and tax-exempt bonds for tax years after 1962. This is explained in the Senate Finance Committee report on the 1962 act as follows:

"Under the bill, as passed by the House and approved by your committee, the rules applicable to mutual fire and casualty companies accruing market discount on bonds are changed. Under present law all mutual fire and casualty companies (and life insurance companies) are required to accrue each year a ratable portion of market discount on bonds and pay tax thereon at ordinary income tax rates (Rev. Rul. 60-210; 1960-1 CB 38). Stock fire and casualty insurance companies, on the other hand, are not required to accrue such discount but when the bond is sold or redeemed they are required to pay tax on the amount of gain resulting from market discount at capital gains rates (if the bond is held for more than 6 months). Since under the general rule of the bill the starting point in computing 'mutual insurance company taxable income' is the gross income computed as if the taxpayer were a stock company, the effect is to treat market discount on bonds for mutual companies, other than the small companies taxable on investment income only, as it is treated by the stock companies." (Pp. 61 and 62, S. Rept. No. 1881, 87th Cong., 2d sess.)

All other taxpayers treat gains realized from market discount on bonds as capital gains subject to tax when the bond is sold or redeemed. The elimination of the required accrual of market discount on municipal bonds for small mutual fire and casualty companies and life insurance companies

will similarly allow these taxpayers to treat their market profits as capital gains.

This bill is limited to discount on municipal bonds and does not also apply to discount on taxable bonds as did the 1962 act amendments for medium and large mutual fire and casualty companies. While there is no reason for not eventually allowing capital gains treatment on market profits from bond discount on taxable bonds, the allowance of such treatment is needed immediately for discount on municipal bonds to avoid litigation which will be costly both to taxpayers and the Government.

This litigation will inevitably result from taxpayers challenging the correctness of Revenue Ruling 60-210 which was issued by the Internal Revenue Service in 1960. In this ruling, the Internal Revenue Service for years after 1960 held that discount placed on municipal bonds by broker-dealers was not interest which was tax exempt but was market profit, taxable at ordinary income tax rates and which was to be accrued ratably by mutual fire and casualty and life insurance companies.

From 1942, when the corresponding 1939 Code provisions of sections 818(b)(1) and 822(d)(2) requiring the accrual of bond discount as interest were first enacted, until the issuance of Revenue Ruling 60-210 in 1960, mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies treated discount on municipal bonds as interest which was exempt from tax. The applicable regulations and tax return forms were not in conflict with this industrywide understanding and treatment.

Revenue Ruling 60-210, however, stated that the position of the Internal Revenue Service was governed by early rulings applicable to other taxpayers who were not required to accrue discount as interest. These early rulings held that the only discount on municipal bonds which was to be considered tax-exempt interest was discount actually placed on the bond by the issuing municipality or State. The application of these early rulings to other taxpayers is that if the discount is not tax-exempt interest, it is market profit subject to capital gains taxes when the bond is sold or redeemed. The application of these rulings to mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies is that if the discount is not tax-exempt interest, it is ratably accrued as taxable interest.

Revenue Ruling 60-210 applies to years beginning after 1960. Undoubtedly affected taxpayers will litigate the correctness of the ruling on the basis that since they are required to accrue all discount as interest, rules applicable to other taxpayers who are not required to accrue discount do not apply, and, therefore, any municipal bond discount which is accruable is tax-exempt interest.

The issue of differentiating between bond discount which is properly interest and bond discount which is properly market profit has always been a troublesome one for the courts to resolve. In this respect the denial by the U.S. Supreme Court of the taxpayer's petition for certiorari on March 5, 1963, from the decision of the Court of Appeal for the Fifth Circuit in *U.S. v. Harrison, et al.* (5th Cir., 1962, 304 F. 2d 835) should be noted. The effect of the denial of certiorari here was to resolve an almost 20 year conflict between the courts of appeal on a bond discount question affecting taxable bonds. Litigation of the correctness of Revenue Ruling 60-210 would start again litigation similar to that which has just been closed by denial of certiorari in the Harrison case.

The enactment of this bill would avoid such litigation by allowing capital gains treatment for bond discount on municipal bonds which does not qualify as tax-exempt interest under Revenue Ruling 60-210 and the early rulings applicable to other tax-

payers who are not required to accrue bond discount. By not requiring life insurance companies and mutual fire and casualty insurance companies to accrue market discount on municipal bonds, these companies are placed in the same position as all other taxpayers with respect to bond discount which is tax-exempt interest and bond discount which is market profit. The proposed legislation would deny mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies the right to treat any bond discount on municipal bonds as tax-exempt interest which such right is not available to other taxpayers. At the same time, the legislation would allow such insurance companies to treat municipal bond discount which is not exempt interest as capital gains when the bond is sold or redeemed, the same treatment accorded all other taxpayers.

The bill is made applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960, the effective date of Revenue Ruling 60-210. This gives the same treatment of municipal bond discount to all mutual fire and casualty companies and to life insurance companies that mutual companies having gross income of over \$500,000 were given by the 1962 Revenue Act for years after December 31, 1962. The bill is necessarily retroactive in order to achieve full correlation with the effective date of Revenue Ruling 60-210.

DUAL DISTRIBUTION AND FAIR-PLAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing, for appropriate reference, two bills that I sponsored in the 87th Congress. One is entitled the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act." The other is entitled the "Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments."

I stated at the time of my prior introduction of this proposed legislation—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21407—that I was not "wedded" to this proposed legislation. That is still true. However, I do believe that public hearings on these two bills by the appropriate legislative committee—presumably the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee—would serve a useful purpose in furthering the understanding of the Congress, the public, and the business community of the problems with which the bills are concerned.

The Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments I reintroduce today is a bill in all respects identical to S. 2641 of the 87th Congress. The Dual Distribution Reporting Act I am reintroducing today is in all respects but one identical to S. 2640 of the 87th Congress. The one change in the elimination in the definitions section, in section 2(h), of the grey area for businesses between \$5 million and \$2 million of annual net sales. In the version introduced today, the indicator is fixed at \$3 million, with no grey area. The general idea of the proposed Dual Distribution Reporting Act is that companies engaged in dual distribution should disclose publicly certain information on each of their establishments that competes with independent customers, so that the antitrust agencies and the public can form a judgment on whether the captive operation is being subsidized as a loss operation for predatory and monopolistic purposes.

The idea of section 2(h) is that a company of very small size could hardly succeed in predatory and monopolistic

efforts even if it wanted to, so such companies might as well be exempted from the reporting, unless someone with an interest in the matter can carry the burden of proof that the company's operations do in fact affect and threaten competition. In the first version of this bill there was a rebuttable presumption that any company having between \$2 and \$5 million a year in sales could not significantly affect commerce by its dual distribution practices and was therefore to be exempt from making the reports called for by the bill. The presumption was to be conclusive as to companies with under \$2 million a year in sales. In the new version, the presumption is to exist but be rebuttable for companies with \$3 million or less in annual sales.

Undoubtedly, there are many other revisions and amendments that should be made in these bills before they are enacted into law, if, indeed, they ever are or should be enacted into law. I reiterate that my purpose in introducing them is not so much to press earnestly for passage of these particular bills, but rather to provide a focus for an enlarged and enlightening discussion of the problems of dual distribution.

As the Senate Small Business Committee said in its 12th annual report:

It is * * * incumbent upon the small business supporters of this legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they averred, and that these bills will help to solve it, not only in their own, but in the national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Senate Small Business Committee in its 12th annual report with reference to these two bills. It is an excellent brief summary of the provisions of the legislation and an indication of the problem area in the distribution system with which these bills are intended to deal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The bills, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1107. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; and

S. 1108. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE 12TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, U. S. SENATE, SENATE REPORT 1491, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, PAGES 31-35

C. DUAL DISTRIBUTION

Dual distribution, a term applied to competition by vertically integrated producers with their own fabricator, wholesaler, and retailer customers, has been the subject of

study and concern by your committee for several years. As early as 1953, dual distribution in the automotive tire industry was noted in a staff report¹ and became the subject of hearings² conducted by Senator HUMPHREY's Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices³ in 1959. Senator RUSSELL B. LONG's Subcommittee on Monopoly held hearings⁴ in 1958 which dealt, in substantial part, with dual distribution in the flat-glass industry, and the full committee issued a report⁵ thereon in 1959. In addition, the committee has had extensive correspondence and numerous staff-level conferences with small businessmen who complained of dual distribution and vertical integration problems in a number of other industries. The committee has been consulted on this subject within the past 2 years by representatives of, at least, the following classifications of independent small business: Manufacturers of aluminum siding, manufacturers of wire rope, assorted steel product fabricators, paint retailers, zinc die-cast alloys, shoe retailers, and gasoline retailers. Glass and tire dealers have continued to urge remedial legislation.

On September 26, 1961, Senator LONG of Louisiana introduced two bills which he described as "a conscientious effort to deal constructively with (these) most vexing problems."⁶ The bills are S. 2641, the "Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments of 1962," and S. 2640, the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act of 1962." They were introduced as a legislative "package" under the heading, "Dual Distribution and Fair Play."⁷

1. S. 2641, 87th Congress, 1st session

The basic premise of the first⁸ of Senator LONG's two bills, as he explained them to the Senate upon introduction " * * * is that it is harmful to competition and also unfair for producers to charge their own captive plants and stores lower prices than they charge independent customer plants and stores which compete horizontally with the captives. The purpose of (the bill) is to make such discriminations unlawful."⁹

Senator LONG acknowledged that this basic premise and purpose were shared with H.R. 2729, 86th Congress (often referred to as the Bentley equal pricing bill) which was the subject of hearings by a House subcommittee in 1959;¹⁰ but he pointed out that

¹ Committee print, "Problems of Independent Tire Dealers," staff report to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 83d Cong., 1st sess., July 27, 1953.

² Hearings, "Dual Distribution in the Automotive Tire Industry, 1959," Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 1st sess., June 17, 18, 19, 1959, pt. 1; id., 86th Cong., 2d sess., Dec. 31, 1959, pt. 2 (supplemental materials).

³ In January 1961, the name of this subcommittee was changed to Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices.

⁴ Hearings, "Competitive Problems of Independent Flat-Glass Dealers" (dual distribution), Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 85th Cong., 2d sess., July 30 and 31, and Oct. 9 and 10, 1958.

⁵ S. Rept. No. 1015, "Studies of Dual Distribution: The Flat-Glass Industry," 86th Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 31, 1959.

⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21409.

⁷ Id., pp. 20205-20208. Reprints are available from this committee.

⁸ The bill identified by Senator Long in his explanatory statement as his "first" bill was unfortunately given the higher number by the bill clerk.

⁹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21409.

¹⁰ Hearings on H.R. 2729 before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

S. 2641, 87th Congress, differs from H.R. 2729, 86th Congress, in these respects:

(a) The Bentley bill would have made price discrimination by a producer in favor of its captive stores and against its independent customers an "unfair method of competition in commerce * * * within the meaning of section 5" of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Long bill would ban such discriminations by an amendment of the Clayton Act, applying to them the rationale and explicit prohibitions of the Robinson-Patman amendments to the act.

(b) The Bentley bill would have applied only to those establishments of a producer which operate in the field of retail distribution. The Long bill would apply not only to retailing but also to those captive establishments of a producer which compete with the producer's independent customers in wholesaling and secondary manufacturing or processing operations.

(c) The Bentley bill would have gone a step further than would the Long bill, in that the former would have attempted to regulate the level of prices charged by direct-selling manufacturers to consumer customers, without the intermediary services of a captive wholesale or retail distribution establishment, while the latter would not. Senator Long stated:

"I recognize the problem with which Mr. Bentley was concerned in that provision of his bill, but, I reiterate, my bill would not attempt to legislate a floor under any price charged by any seller to a consumer. In those situations where it is practicable for a consumer to buy direct from a maker's factory, without any middlemen whatsoever, that would seem to me to be the course which prudence, economy, and efficiency dictate be taken, and I see no reason for Congress to interfere in the process by which demand and supply considerations establish price in such transactions.

"But in those situations in which a producer first induces an independent distributor or manufacturer to make an investment in plant, equipment, inventory, and time in order to carry out a certain function with regard to the producer's product, then turns around and sets up his own store or plant to perform the identical function, in direct competition with the independent, it seems to me to be simple equity and sensible economic regulation to require the producer to treat his captive and his customer alike. If the Robinson-Patman Act makes sense, then this does, too."¹¹

(d) An additional provision of S. 2641, not contained in the Bentley bill, would require producers, in times of short supply brought about by strikes or fires or other causes beyond a producer's control, not to cut down supplies to independent customers unless supplies to captive competitors of those customers were reduced in the same proportion.

2. S. 2640, 87th Congress, 1st session

Senator Long's second bill, the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act of 1962," is intended, according to its sponsor " * * * to meet one of the most telling and forceful of the criticisms of the Bentley bill which were offered by the Federal Trade Commission at the 1959 hearings."¹²

The Commission had pointed out to the House Commerce Subcommittee that enactment of the bill would be " * * * without meaningful consequences. * * * A manufacturer could deliver to its own retail outlets at the same price at which deliveries are made to other retailers, but the manufacturer-owned retail outlet could resell at

a low markup which no independent retailer could meet."¹³

Acknowledging the accuracy of this observation, Senator Long stated that this was " * * * precisely the point which is most often and most loudly decried by independent small businessmen who are suddenly confronted by competition from their suppliers.

" * * * * *
"The theory of my Dual Distribution Reporting Act is that, if a producer influences independent small businessmen to make an investment in the product of that producer, then decides to jeopardize the independent's investment by competing with him, the producer owes the independent a duty, in equity and fairness, to operate the captive establishment on the basis of a separate profit on its own function, not as a no-profit operation subsidized by other functions of the company. The purpose of my reporting bill is to require companies engaged in dual distribution to make public certain operating data on each product and each establishment that is involved in the dual distribution process. The bill would not require a dual distributor to adhere to any particular level of prices or markup or to make any specified profit at any level of operation. It would require that information be disclosed by which competitors, consumers, and the agencies that administer the antitrust laws could discern whether a particular product or a particular establishment were being utilized, not for separate profit but as a tool of power for purposes of monopolization.

3. Summary and recommendation

Vertical integration is a growing trend and is coming to be widely recognized and accepted, by large and small business alike, as a means—often legitimate, logical, and even necessary—to more efficient and economical operations in today's vigorously competitive markets. But vertical integration by smaller businesses, whether forward from manufacturing or backward from distribution activities, is practicable, if at all, only through contractual relationships with other independent businesses, while big businesses, with vast capital resources, are able to establish or acquire and carry on integrated operations under a common ownership.

It is indisputable that the antitrust laws seriously limit the extent and flexibility of vertical integration by contract; but many practices, including the most blatant sort of price discriminations, which are forbidden to the small-business contract-integrator are quite lawfully available to the big-business ownership-integrator.¹⁴ Your committee believes that, under conditions of perfect (if now somewhat visionary) justice and equity, the law should deal evenly and equally with that mode of vertical integration available to

¹³ Statement of Hon. Earl W. Kintner, chairman, Federal Trade Commission, hearings, op. cit., supra, note 31, at p. 69.

¹⁴ For an exhaustive review of existing law on this point, together with penetrating discussion of the thorny questions of business management and public policy that arise thereunder, see: Kessler and Stern, "Competition, Contract, and Vertical Integration," 69 Yale Law Journal 1 (1959). At p. 116, the authors, note: "In addition to the antitrust laws, the laws regulating pricing significantly affect ownership and contract as vertical integration devices. The form of integration adopted—contract or ownership—may vary considerably the impact of such legislation on the integrated firms. For example, the principal statute—sec. 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act, which forbids price discrimination—is applicable only to contractual relationships."

small business—contract integration—and the mode which, in the nature of things, is available only to big business—ownership integration. But this is a goal more easily stated than attained. Those who accept the goal as desirable and practical will differ on the approach and methods to be pursued—and some reasonable men and friends of small business will reject the goal itself. One approach might be to loose some of the shackles on contract integration; and consideration might be given to restraints on ownership integration more nearly comparable to those now applicable to contract integration. The Long bills embody such an approach. S. 2641 would simply make the Robinson-Patman prohibitions against price discriminations among horizontally competing customers of a seller, which now are one limitation on the freedom of maneuver of contract integration systems, equally and identically applicable as limitations on ownership integration systems. S. 2640 would not extend to ownership integration systems the stern law that is imposed by the natural laws of the market on contract integration systems; that each establishment make a profit on its own functional operation or close. But the bill would draw the contract and ownership integration systems a step closer to competitive parity by removing the veil of secrecy from operations of ownership-integration establishments at low profit, no profit, or a loss.

Your committee agrees with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly that the problem and these legislative proposals deserve—and recommends that they receive—close scrutiny, including public hearings, by the Senate Judiciary Committee, to which they have been referred. Your committee notes with pleasure that Senator KEFAUVER's Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has indicated that such hearings will be held. At that time it will be incumbent upon the small-business supporters of this legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they have averred, and that these bills will help to solve it, not only in their own but in the national interest.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT OF 1963

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators KUCHEL, METCALF, and ENGLE, a proposed Water Resources Planning Act and request that it lie on the desk for 3 days to permit any Senators who desire to do so to cosponsor it.

There is already pending S. 2, a water resources research bill. This bill, which deals with river basin planning, should not be confused with the research measure.

The original draft of the bill I now introduce was sent to Congress by President Kennedy on July 13, 1961. On the following day it was introduced and became S. 2246 of the 87th Congress.

On July 26, and again on August 16, 1961, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works held joint hearings on the President's proposal.

At that time, the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments had not completed a survey of State views on the proposed planning bill. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee consequently held a

¹¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21409-10.

¹² Id. at 20208.

further hearing on the message on March 2, 1962. The interstate conference then presented an extensive redraft of the proposed legislation. Some felt that the revisions would amount to a surrender of Federal prerogatives in the water field, to which there was considerable objection. Some members despaired of ever being able to reconcile State and Federal views and achieving comprehensive planning of the Nation's major river basins by the Federal Government and the States. I hope that this is now on the way to being done.

The bill was originally proposed by President Kennedy in response to recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources;

The first recommendation of the select committee read:

1. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States. Such plans should take into account the prospective demands for all purposes served through water development giving full recognition to non-revenue-yielding purposes such as streamflow regulation, outdoor recreation, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and keeping in mind the ultimate need for optimum development of all water resources. All practicable means of meeting demands should be considered. The executive branch is requested to submit plans to the Congress in January 1962, for undertaking and completing such studies in all basins by 1970. Once prepared, the reports should be brought up to date periodically. Reports on individual projects submitted to the Congress for authorization should specify how the project fits into the comprehensive long-range program, and the range of alternative purposes that might be served by the resources needed for the recommended projects.

The second recommendation of the select committee was for a 10-year program of aid to States to stimulate more active participation by the States in planning, development, and management of our water resources. A minimum program of \$5 million annually in grants to the States for 10 years—the funds to be matched by the States—was recommended.

The fourth recommendation of the select committee was for preparation of a biennial assessment of the water supply-demand outlook for each of the water resource regions of the Nation. The executive branch was requested to submit the first such report during January 1963.

The President's water resources planning proposal was designed to meet all three of the recommendations I have summarized.

Title I of the bill authorized the establishment of a Federal Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare. It is to be the Council's functions to coordinate Federal river basin planning operations and to prepare the biennial supply-demand assessment, as well as to review basin plans when completed.

Title II of the President's bill was a proposal to authorize him to establish river basin planning commissions which would include representatives of affected States appointed by the President. Governors were extended the privilege of nominating persons for appointment as State representatives.

The bill was and is a nonpartisan proposal. To illustrate this fact, I point out that this title, title II, recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy, was first transmitted to us as a separate bill by the Eisenhower administration on January 16, 1961. In his last budget message to the Congress, President Eisenhower discussed the need for coordinated planning of water resources to assure optimum development. Subsequently, on January 16, 1961, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, then Mr. Maurice H. Stans, transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, a draft bill to implement President Eisenhower's recommendation by authorizing Presidential establishment of the river basin planning commissions. It was that draft bill which subsequently became title II of President Kennedy's bill.

Title III of President Kennedy's water resources planning measure provided for the 10 year, \$5 million matching fund for water resources planning by the States which the Select Committee on National Water Resources recommended. The title is essentially identical to measures which both the late Senator Robert S. Kerr and I introduced in the 87th Congress.

President Kennedy continues to urge the enactment of legislation to achieve optimum river basin planning and development. In his budget message in January, the President said:

Major emphasis is being given within the Federal Government to coordinated planning of river basin development and research on water resources. In addition, legislation is again recommended to provide for comprehensive and coordinated water resources planning by Federal and State agencies and to authorize limited grants to strengthen State planning.

There has been little or no opposition to titles I and III of the President's bill, providing for the establishment of a Federal Water Resources Council composed of four Secretaries whose departments have major water resource programs, and authorizing State aid. They have been little changed in the revision I have just introduced.

Opposition to the other title of the bill, title II, has been directed at the nature and mechanics for establishing the individual river basin planning commissions rather than at the basic idea of creating commissions or getting at the planning job.

The President proposed, as his predecessor had proposed, that the commissions be established and appointed by the Federal Chief Executive when one or more States in a basin requested the establishment of a commission.

The States objected, among other things, to establishment of a river basin

planning commission at the request of only one State; they contended that two-thirds of the States involved should participate in any such request before a commission could be established.

The States objected also to appointment of the States representatives on the commissions by the President, and the consequent Federal nature of the commissions; they insisted on the right to appoint their own representatives who would have no master but the State that each represented.

The States also sought language which would recognize their primary interest in water resources.

The matter of State versus Federal rights in water resources is a dispute nearly as old as our Nation itself. It is still unsettled. States and the Federal Government have argued about it, carried lawsuits to the Supreme Court about it, and made it an issue in political campaigns. Few Congresses in recent decades have failed to have hearings on bills proposing a settlement. None has been enacted.

During the hearings on the President's planning bill last year, I challenged one of the witnesses to name an instance where this longstanding dispute has actually held up a water project. The instance is yet to be cited.

At my direction, a revision of the Water Resources Planning Act has been worked out with the representatives of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments which is intended to preserve the status quo in regard to water rights; to let the debate over State versus Federal rights proceed without any disturbance whatsoever, but at the same time to let State and Federal planners proceed to work out together much-needed, comprehensive development plans.

The revision, which is the bill I have just introduced, proceeds on the basis of two fundamentals, stated in the bill.

First, that nothing in the act is to be construed as either expanding or diminishing either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibilities or rights in respect to water.

Second, it is recognized that in any instance where necessary agreement cannot be reached on the establishment of a river basin planning commission under the provisions of the act, the Federal Government may, if it considers such planning needed, proceed itself by any of the conventional, alternative methods now followed, or in a new and proper way, to plan for the development of a river which is of Federal concern. Similarly, if a Federal-State commission set up under the provisions of the bill should disagree and be unable to report a development plan, other means of planning could be substituted.

As revised, the bill provides that a river basin planning commission may be established by the President when the Federal Water Resources Council and one-half the States involved agree to it. The President will appoint a chairman. Representatives will be appointed by

Federal agencies concerned. The American section of any international commission which may be involved will also have a representative. The States will appoint their own representatives to the commissions. Any interstate compact commission involved may name its own representative.

To assure that neither Federal nor States rights will be overridden in the planning, the revised bill provides that there shall be two and only two votes in each commission. The chairman, appointed by the President, will cast one vote for the Federal agencies. The vice chairman, elected by the State representatives, will cast one vote at the instruction of the States.

Planning thus must be either by agreement or by the presentation of alternative plans to the President and Congress, and to the States involved. Planning decisions will not become a matter of whether the Federal Government or the States have the most representatives on a particular commission. It will be by agreement, or the final decision will be referred to the governments involved. If a commission is entirely unable to agree on a plan, then another means of planning will have to be substituted.

To those of us in political life, where issues are all finally settled by vote, this arrangement for equal Federal-State voting may appear impractical. Stalemates are not impossible. But they are not likely, for the planning process is one of arriving at a consensus based on facts—of devising engineering works and management plans for water which will yield the greatest benefits to the area involved. If studies are done thoroughly, then the facts make the decisions—not philosophical points of view. Both the differing nature of the planning process from the political process, and our experiences with planning commissions in the past, are assurance that stalemates will be rare and, if they occur, the alternatives can be submitted in the final report of a commission and the choice can be made by the Congress and the States involved.

The commissions will be entities of themselves—not Federal commissions or State commissions, but Federal-State partnerships with individual identity much as Interstate Compact Commissions are entities in their own right.

Copy of the draft of the bill has been submitted to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by Mr. Frank Bane and including Senators MUNDT, ERVIN, and MUSKIE from this body, for it could become a significant new pattern for Federal-State relationships in more than the water resources planning field. A report on the proposal is expected from that Commission.

Observers for the executive branch of the Government have been present at all meetings between the committee staff and representatives of the State governments. The measure as revised will now be sent to the executive agencies for their review and recommendations. There will be further hearings. Doubtless we will have suggestions for further revision, and suggestions to restore the

original Federal nature of the commissions.

To the extremists in the State-Federal water rights issue, who would prefer to waste our water resources than to concede a drop of authority or jurisdiction to their antagonist, I would like to say they are hopelessly behind the times.

The Federal Government has responsibilities and authorities in the water field, and so do the States. And we cannot do comprehensive water resources planning without involving both State and Federal prerogatives. Water within a river basin cannot be separated into "State water" and "Federal water" which are planned separately.

I have not heard it contended yet that States cannot regulate withdrawals of ground water under non-Federal lands within their borders. It is admitted that in many water-short areas of the Nation we must have conjunctive surface water and ground water management if we are to have comprehensive management for optimum benefits. Translated into political terms, that means we are also going to have to have conjunctive Federal-State planning and management of water resources, or we will fall far short of the optimum benefit goals that we seek.

Here in the Congress of the United States we legislate in very much the same fashion as is proposed in the new, revised river basin planning commissions. The House and the Senate either agree on legislation, or there is no legislation. As total entities, the House of Representatives has one voice and the Senate has one voice in this Congress.

Sometimes we fume considerably about it, but almost every year we pass necessary appropriations and get the other essential legislation passed. In my judgment, the Federal-State water commissions, realizing the necessity for water planning, also will get the job done. Their task will be much more of an engineering nature, with fewer philosophical and political issues to resolve, than the decisions we manage to make regularly between the House and Senate.

There is assurance that State governments will vigorously support the measure as revised.

The Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments, meeting in Chicago in December, approved the nearly-completed work of the consulting group and directed their representatives to "continue * * * their work aiming toward passage of a bill."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the conference resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON WATER PROBLEMS OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS IN REGARD TO FEDERAL-STATE WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Whereas the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, by resolution at previous annual meetings has urged coordination of

and financial support for Federal and State water resources planning; and

Whereas there was considered in the 87th Congress legislation to provide for water resources planning on a comprehensive and coordinated basis; and

Whereas the executive and policy committees by direction of the conference at its last annual meeting conferred with staff representatives of the appropriate committees of Congress and relevant Federal agencies in an effort to evolve amendments to such legislation that would more nearly reflect the views of the States; and

Whereas at this meeting the conference received a report on these consultations indicating that progress is being made in implementing the policies set forth in the resolution adopted at the last annual meeting: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive and policy committees be authorized and directed to continue along the lines of their work during the past year aiming toward passage of a bill that will conform to the above policies.

Mr. ANDERSON. Subsequent to the interstate conference's annual meeting in Chicago, the revised bill was completed and I have received a hearty endorsement of it from Dr. Garland Hershey, chairman. I request unanimous consent to have Dr. Hershey's letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON
WATER PROBLEMS,

Chicago, Ill., January 22, 1963.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I am enclosing a copy of the water resources planning bill introduced by you in the 87th Congress as S. 2246, with suggested revisions which have been worked out in conferences between the policy and executive committees of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems and Mr. Benton J. Stong of your staff.

The bill as revised is one we believe to be acceptable to the States. In title II, it provides for genuine Federal-State river basin commissions to serve as the principal agencies to coordinate Federal, State, interstate and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in the areas they would serve. Elsewhere in the bill changes have been made to carry out this concept. With respect to titles I and III, on the other hand, we have made relatively fewer changes. The attached measure, or one similar to it, is one that the Interstate Conference on Water Problems will support with enthusiasm.

On behalf of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, I wish to thank you for your courtesy in giving the conference, and through it the States, an opportunity to present its views on this very important matter. I should also like to thank you for having made available to us the services of Mr. Stong. His knowledge and advice were very useful to us.

Yours very truly,

H. GARLAND HERSHEY,
Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Conservation Commissioner Harold Wilm, of New York State, who is chairman of the interstate conference's policy committee, has also written that "I shall do all that I can to urge that the States support" the revised bill. He declares the revision an excellent bill. Mr. President, I ask unan-

imious consent to have Mr. Wilm's letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON
WATER PROBLEMS,
Albany, N.Y., January 18, 1963.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I have been informed by Dr. Garland Hershey, chairman of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, that he has sent you a copy of the water resources planning bill as it has been revised by the policy and executive committee of the conference in consultations with your staff.

As the chairman of the policy committee, both last year and this, I have attended almost every meeting of the State officials with Mr. Benton J. Stong of your staff at which the revised measure was hammered out. In my view, the amended bill is an excellent one. I shall do all I can to urge that the States support it.

Thank you very much for making it possible for the Interstate Conference on Water Problems to take part in the revision of the bill. I can assure you that the policy committee will continue to cooperate with you and the committee in your further consideration of this legislation.

Yours very truly,

H. G. WILM,
Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Upon completion of the revision of the President's bill, it was submitted to Theodore M. Schad, who served as staff director of the Select Committee on National Water Resources. Mr. Schad has written:

In accordance with your instructions, I looked at the bill from the viewpoint of whether it would be an adequate vehicle for carrying out the first, second, and fourth recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

My general reaction is that the bill would be adequate for the purpose desired.

Mr. Schad raised questions and suggested revisions to further improve the bill which have been adopted, or will be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as the measure is studied.

It is my hope that hearings can be held at an early date.

If we can enact river basin planning legislation during the present Congress, we will have accomplished a feat which has been more than a half century in the making.

As I have pointed out before, the first recommendation for comprehensive planning of the river basins of America for optimum development was made in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt's National Waterways Commission.

In the intervening 55 years we have, with the single exception of the Tennessee Valley, done our planning mostly in bits and pieces as the exigencies of the occasion required.

We now face shortages of water of good quality in many areas of the Nation. Perhaps we can now finally tackle this much-needed work on a nationwide basis.

In closing these remarks, I want to express my appreciation to the State

people who have worked patiently and persistently on the revised draft.

They include Sam Thompson of Senator EASTLAND's staff, who is also chairman of his State's water board and was chairman of the Interstate Conference on Water Resources during the year 1962. Sam was a regular participant in working sessions.

Mr. Harold Wilm, the New York State conservation commissioner who is the interstate conference's policy committee chairman, commuted from Albany to attend nearly every meeting. We are indebted to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York for having made Mr. Wilm's participation possible. Mr. Wilm has been a constructive force at all times.

Also, Mr. Charles Schwan and Mitchell Wendell of the staff of the Council of State Governments here in Washington, who have made major contributions to the work.

Mr. Sid McFarland of the House Interior Committee, Mr. Henry Caulfield and Mr. E. D. Eaton of the Interior Department have been present from time to time.

Finally, Mr. President, for myself and other members of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, which completed its work and went out of business 2 years ago, I want to express appreciation to President John F. Kennedy for following up and keeping before Congress and the country the urgency of meeting our water problems.

Although the President comes from a State where water shortages are not so acute as they are in my own Southwest, he demonstrates an awareness of the crucial problems of each of the regions of this Nation by pressing for water legislation, and for wise management of our natural resources of every kind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the proposed Water Resources Planning Act which I have just introduced so it will be available to Members considering cosponsorship.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources throughout the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning, 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:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act of 1963".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit the jurisdiction of responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;

(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

SEC. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein, and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

SEC. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water resources projects.

SEC. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(a)(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation;

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(4) recommend such modifications in such plan or revision as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(5) transmit such plan or revision, including its recommendations and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) Hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ such personnel as it deems advisable, including a staff director at civil service grade 18; (5) place one position, in addition to the staff director, above the level of grade GS-15, subject to the standards and procedures of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by such section; (6) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals; (7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Creation of commissions

SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the region, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested, (2) is made in

writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located. Such concurrences shall be in writing. Whenever, within a reasonable time, sufficient concurrences by States are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a commission be established, the Council may find that the national interest requires: coordinated and comprehensive planning in the region, river basin or group of river basins with respect to which it has made a request and shall, in the event of such finding, recommend to the President an alternative means of accomplishing such planning.

(b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its region, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related land resources;

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its region, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

Membership of commissions

SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations of the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, but a retired commissioned officer of one of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may be appointed chairman without prejudice to his retired status and may receive the compensation payable under section 206(c) of this Act in addition to his retired pay, provided that the combined rate shall not exceed the applicable maximum rate or rates set forth in such section for the chairman;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created.

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be ap-

pointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

Organization of commissions

SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the council and not less than one-half of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided*, That studies, data and other materials useful in water resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided*, That the chairman and vice-chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) At such time as voting is considered necessary in conducting the business of a commission, the voting shall be only by the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and by the vice-chairman, upon instruction from the State member.

Duties of the commissions

SEC. 204. (a) Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act:

(2) submit to the council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, and any major necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major revision to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each

such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan or revision.

(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

SEC. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem; (5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency; (6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel; (7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and

expenditures of funds available to such commission. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the chairman shall be governed by the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof.

Compensation of commission members

SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than \$100 per day and shall not exceed \$12,000 in any year.

SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government to finance each commission shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended. The Chairman and the State members shall negotiate an appropriate amount to be furnished by each State as that State's share in financing the commission. The Federal appropriation requested by the commission each year shall be the total of the commission's budget for the year less amounts paid by the States during the twelve months ending the preceding June 30. Funds received from the States shall be deposited in the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements shall be audited by a qualified public accountant who, where practicable, shall be licensed or certified by a regulatory body of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the commission.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States in the planning and other activities authorized by this Act are to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, \$5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing comprehensive water resources plans and in par-

ticipating in the development of the comprehensive water resources plans authorized in title II of this Act.

Allotments

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under section 305) of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

State programs

SEC. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal and State agencies having responsibilities in such fields;

(2) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(3) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(4) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

Review

SEC. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

Federal share

SEC. 305. (a) The Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out its approved program less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the entire United States, except that (1)

the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per centum or less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per centum: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Federal share exceed a State's allotment under section 302.

(b) The Federal shares shall be promulgated by the Council on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the entire United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for the first fiscal year for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and the succeeding fiscal year, and a promulgation shall thereafter be made for each succeeding two years and shall be conclusive for such years.

Payments

SEC. 306. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Council may determine.

Definition

SEC. 307. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles I and II and the administration of title III.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

Delegation of functions

SEC. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council, its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

Utilization of personnel

SEC. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Employee benefits

SEC. 405. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with any commission established under section 201 of this Act for coverage of the river basin commission's employees in the employee benefit programs of the Federal Government, as provided in section 205(a) (6) of this Act.

EXTRA \$600 TAX EXEMPTION FOR STUDENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would, if enacted, provide an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student in an institution of higher education.

In this age of rockets and missiles, of progress and constant hurry, it is becoming more and more important that we have a well-educated citizenry. There is a crying demand for technicians and specialists of all kinds and less and less of a place in our work force for the unskilled and untrained worker.

At a time when our society is demanding more and more educated people, the costs of college education are rising. In its report on S. 1241, the higher education bill which was before the Senate last year, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare pointed out that college "tuition and fee charges alone have increased 86 percent in the past decade and promise to increase still further;" that "during the past school year, the average expense incurred by a student living away from home was \$1,650 per year." The committee said that each year, "between 60,000 and 100,000 high school graduates in the top 20 to 30 percent of their class fail to go on to college for this reason." This, in my estimation, is a very real loss to America, and we should do something about it.

The extra \$600 tax exemption for which my bill provides would aid ambitious young people and would make a college education possible for many who otherwise would not be able to afford college. I do not believe we can afford to do less for our young people than to offer them every possible opportunity for an education. Therefore, I am hopeful that every consideration will be given to my proposal and that ultimately favorable action will be taken on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1114) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LOANS TO STUDENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 2 years ago, I first introduced a bill to provide Government guarantees on loans to students for higher education. This year, I was pleased to note, President Kennedy endorsed this idea and made it a part of his message on better schools and schooling for our Nation. I, therefore, introduce a bill for this purpose, for appropriate reference.

In essence, this measure would set up a system of loan insurance for needy youngsters in colleges and universities. It would be similar in nature to the highly successful Federal Housing Administration system. If the FHA was suc-

cessful in promoting homeownership without outlay of large sums of Federal money, so can this school insurance loan program be successful in putting college within the reach of more of our talented young people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1115) to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STRIP MINING—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] have asked that they be permitted to become cosponsors of the strip mining bill (S. 1013), which I introduced on the 7th of this month. I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the bill, the names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may be added.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BERNARD M. DECKER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 22, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge, Northern District of Illinois, recess appointment.

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 Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself.

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. HARTKE:

Address entitled "Challenge to Americans," delivered by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON before the National Advertising Council, in Washington, D.C., on March 12, 1963.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

Address on the budget, delivered by Senator HARTKE before a dinner group at the Brookings Institution, in Washington, D.C., on March 11, 1963.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 63, House bill 2438, to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill which is before the Senate for consideration involves a 4-year extension of five separate provisions of law, all of which relate to maintaining the strength and health of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The following provisions of law would be extended for a period of 4 years:

First, the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces;

Second, the authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists;

Third, the suspension of permanent limitations on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces;

Fourth, the authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents; and

Fifth, the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

REGULAR DRAFT

Perhaps the most significant objective of the bill is the extension of authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces. Unless extended, this authority would expire on July 1 of this year. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension until July 1, 1967.

Under existing conditions, draft calls are relatively low. In the fiscal year 1962, the number of men inducted totaled 157,500. About 76,000 inductees will be required during the fiscal year 1963, this being a relatively low replacement year. For the 4-year period from 1964 through 1967, the estimate is that in the absence of any unforeseen contingency, the inductions will average about 90,000 a year.

These figures should not mislead one to believe that the authority to induct is unimportant to the procurement of the necessary manpower for our Armed Forces. Beyond the number inducted each year, about 400,000 persons volunteer for enlistment in one of the many programs available throughout the Department of Defense. All the manpower authorities I know recognize that the existence of the draft causes many of these enlistments. The indirect effect of the draft is not limited to voluntary enlistments by noncommissioned members of the Armed Forces. The draft also encourages participation in the ROTC programs, enrollment in officer candidate schools, and applications for direct appointment of officers from civilian life.

While at the moment the Army is the only military service that requires inductees, elimination of the draft would drastically affect the manpower situation in all the other Armed Forces. Ending the draft not only would adversely affect the active duty strength of the Armed Forces, but also it would seriously reduce the strength of our Reserve forces.

The draft has been continuously in effect since 1940, except for the period of March 1947 to June of 1948. In this hiatus the strength of the Armed Forces dropped to about 1,384,000 at a time when the desired strength was slightly more than 2 million. I think this experience is clear evidence that we cannot safely rely on purely voluntary service to maintain the strength of our Armed Forces.

I believe no thoughtful person would seriously contend that existing law and its administration are perfectly equitable or are completely free of injustices. Only a system involving universal service would be completely nondiscriminatory. I would remind the Senate, however, that our existing system for selection and induction is the product of many years of experience, that it is administered largely by unpaid volunteers at the local level, and that no one has yet proposed a substitute that would be practical, effective, or more fair, and that would supply the military establishments with the necessary personnel.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the extension of this law should be for a period of only 2 years, and that a commission or a study group should be appointed to examine other ways of procuring military manpower. In my opinion this approach only temporizes with a serious subject. The law has been extended for a period of 4 years consistently since 1951. This does not mean, of course, that a 4-year extension is an inviolable requirement, but an extension of this duration does provide a sound basis for planning and it does not mislead the few persons who may be trying to evade military service into thinking that by postponing a decision they may completely escape liability.

Nor does the proposal for a study commission have a great deal of appeal for me. I know this is an era of commissions, boards, factfinding groups, and panels. The mere naming of a group for further study provides no easy solution for difficult problems, however, and if anyone has a workable alternative to the draft he has not yet communicated the details of this substitute to the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee report contains a summary of the major features of the existing Selective Service procedures. I shall not discuss these features in detail. I do wish to point out, though, that a young man may select almost any point between his reaching the age of 18½ and the age of 26 for the performance of his military service. Some persons have urged that since the average age of induction is between 22 and 23, and that since relatively few persons are being inducted, the maximum age of liability

should be reduced. Reduction of the maximum age of liability would cause some year groups not to bear their normal share of service, and also it would compress the period within which a young man must make a decision. If the existing ages of liability prolong one young man's uncertainty about service, they also permit many other young men to elect the time that is the least inconvenient to them for the performance of their service. Some young men prefer to discharge their obligation before undertaking further schooling, and others choose to postpone service until after their formal education is complete. "Option" is a popular word in the defense lexicon of today and this system certainly provides abundant options, not only in connection with the age for service, but also in connection with the branch of service or the program that is most suited to an individual's personal preference.

Neither do I believe that the Selective Service System is as inequitable as it has been alleged to be by its critics. An analysis of manpower statistics shows that of the persons who are not performing military service, the two largest categories are fathers and those who are not qualified for physical or mental reasons, or for both. About 6 out of every 10 young men who reached age 26 last year had performed military service, or were in the process of discharging their obligation. About 3 out of 10 had been found unfit for service. The remaining 1 out of the 10 was either a father or had received a statutory deferment because of his occupation.

Some religious groups have earnestly suggested that the draft should be ended. I do not question their good faith, but I am utterly unable to understand their reasoning. If we are not militarily strong the chances are that we would be conquered by a system that does not believe in God and that discourages religious worship. Until the Communists show some of the religious characteristics that we are urged to demonstrate by those who would end the draft, termination of Selective Service would tend to suppress a religious point of view instead of promoting it.

In summary, Mr. President, I think the need for extending the draft is unquestionable.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

Section 2 of the bill would continue a suspension of several limitations on the personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

Under the permanent ceilings the strength of the Army is limited to 837,000, the Air Force 502,000, and the Navy to 500,000. The strengths of these services on December 31, 1962, were:

| | |
|----------------|---------|
| Army..... | 952,000 |
| Navy..... | 581,000 |
| Air Force..... | 863,000 |

Thus it is obvious that unless section 2 of the bill is approved on July 1 of this year the Army would have to reduce its strength by 115,000, the Navy would have to lose 81,000 enlisted members and a proportionate number of officers, and the Air Force reduction in strength would be 361,000. Obviously the permanent

ceilings cannot realistically be imposed at this time and the suspension must be continued.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT

Section 3 of the bill contemplates continuation of the authority for paying quarters allowances to enlisted members in the lower pay grades.

There is no permanent authority for the payment of quarters allowances to members of the Armed Forces in the lower pay grades because the peacetime policy of the military services prohibits the enlistment or reenlistment of members of the lower three pay grades and part of the fourth pay grade if these members have dependents. This peacetime policy has been modified continuously since 1950 and it seems that it will be necessary to continue to encourage service by persons in the power pay grades even though they have dependents.

Under the Dependents Assistance Act, the quarters allowances that are payable to enlisted members in pay grades E-1 through E-4—with 4 years or less of service—vary from \$55.20 a month to \$105 a month for those with three or more dependents. To receive these allowances a member must have in effect an allotment payable to his dependents in an amount equal to these allowances, plus \$40 of his pay. If this law is not extended enlisted members in these grades would be entitled to a quarters allowance of only \$45 a month, irrespective of the number of their dependents. Termination of this authority clearly would create a financial hardship for these persons.

SELECTIVE INDUCTION FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Section 4 of the bill would continue authority for the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists and to order physicians and dentists who are members of Reserve components to active duty for 24 months if they had not already served on active duty for at least 1 year.

Despite some special inducements for physicians and dentists, the Department of Defense has been unable to recruit enough Regular doctors and dentists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. For this reason it is necessary to provide for the temporary service of a sufficient number of doctors and dentists to bridge the gap between the number of Regulars and the requirements of the Armed Forces.

Persons deferred under the Universal Military Training and Service Act remain liable for induction until they reach the age of 35. Since most physicians and dentists are deferred to continue their professional education, they incur a liability for induction until age 35. A 1957 act authorized the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists and to order physicians and dentists in the Reserve components to active duty. The combination of these authorities normally results in acceptance of Reserve commissions by physicians and dentists, who are ordered to active duty after

completion of their training. These authorities would expire on July 1, 1963, and this bill would extend the authorities for another 4 years, until July 1, 1967.

If these special authorities were permitted to expire, the number of physicians and dentists on active duty unquestionably would be reduced to unacceptable levels.

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

As an inducement to the procurement of more physicians and dentists for active military service and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians has been in effect for several years. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty receive special pay of \$100 a month; those with 2 to 6 years of service receive \$150 monthly; those with 6 to 10 years of service receive \$200 a month, and those with more than 10 years of service receive \$250 a month. Veterinarians receive \$100 of special pay a month, irrespective of their length of service.

If section 5 of the bill were not enacted, physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1963, would not receive this special pay, although those officers in these categories who entered on active duty before July 1, 1963, would continue to receive special pay. Since the military services continue to need more officers in these categories, the authority for special pay should be continued.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on the bill. The bill is one of the more important items in the legislative program of the Department of Defense this year.

Mr. President, I believe that the committee report on the bill explains each provision of the bill in detail. The program has been operational for a number of years. The extension of the bill is of vital importance to the maintenance of our defense posture as well as to maintain the program of the Department of Defense even for this year. I hope the bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today the harsh necessities of the cold war require that Congress take action to extend the compulsory draft law for another period. I think all of us are satisfied that the large manpower requirements of our Armed Forces at their present levels of strength require a form of compulsion to encourage enlistments as well as make up any other needed personnel. These are the hard facts of the cold war; our forces are required around the world in varying degrees of hardships and discomfort to combat aggression by a determined foe. Some of them are fighting; all of them are ready to fight. This is the price we must pay to maintain freedom, and this this country is determined to do.

But although we recognize the necessity of this program for induction into the Armed Forces, most of us are not

unmindful of the inequities it causes to many of our youth who must carry this burden of defending freedom for all of us. Only around one-half of the young men subject to the draft ever serve a substantial period of military duty. Their contemporaries forge ahead in the competitive race of civilian life. I am satisfied that the various combinations of requirements of the armed services and the exemption policies of the Selective Service System are administered on a fair basis, but these various policies, justified as they may be by other goals of necessity, still result in the overall inequity by which one young man is required to serve while another is not. I know many Senators share my concern that this Nation is not doing enough to redress this inequity that our national policy places on so many men.

To correct this inequity, 39 of us are cosponsoring S. 5 the cold war GI bill. We hope through this plan to repay in some way the young men who served for the time, effort, and courage demanded of them to defend freedom. We propose educational and training allowances and home loan guarantees for these veterans to help them catch up with their contemporaries who were allowed to stay in civilian life. Almost all of these young men consider it an honor to serve their country, and would be reluctant to insist that the Government owes any special obligation to them, but we who create the inequity by setting the policies do feel the necessity for providing an adequate compensation for their sacrifices.

So as we vote to extend the draft for another 4 years, let it not be said that we are insensitive to the needs of the cold war veteran. It is my expectation to bring to the floor of the Senate this session the cold war GI bill. In this way, before many weeks pass, we can demonstrate to the youth of the country that the draft laws do not operate as an arbitrary capricious roulette wheel which penalizes some but not others. We shall provide adequate recognition and compensation for the burden that our young veterans have carried for all of us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 2438) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was necessarily absent from the Chamber earlier in the day when the Draft Extension Act was passed. His staff has asked me to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Oregon, indicating that he desires to be recorded against the extension of the draft. He

is necessarily absent, inasmuch as he is joining the President on his trip to Costa Rica.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE IN
OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2438

It is with real regret that I am asking to be recorded against extension of the draft. Had I been present today, instead of on my way to Mexico and Costa Rica, I would have offered a substitute amendment, extending the draft for a 2-year period, rather than for 4 years.

I offered such an amendment in 1959. It was my hope and expectation that during those 2 years, manpower studies would be undertaken that would produce alternatives to selective service as a means of assuring adequate manpower for the Armed Forces. That year, the congressional critics of the waste of manpower under selective service were "sweet talked" by both the executive branch and the Armed Services Committee with pledges that steps would be taken to review manpower policies. Senator CASE of South Dakota offered an amendment on the Senate floor which I supported, to set up a civilian commission to do this job. We were told that such a commission was not needed, because the Armed Services Committee of the Senate was going to appoint a subcommittee to conduct continuing studies of the utilization of military manpower.

That was sufficient to defeat the 2-year extension, with its proposed manpower study.

So far as I know, that was the end of the matter. If any studies were ever made, their results are not apparent. Not a thing has been done; not a change for the better has been made. Selective service remains just as discriminatory in its selection as before, and just as unfair to the young men of the Nation. For the injustices it works upon American citizens, the Congress must bear heavy responsibility.

But it is first of all the responsibility of the Pentagon to provide an efficient means of acquiring essential manpower. It is an astonishing thing to me that in a Pentagon building bulging with the so-called whiz kids and slide-rule minds that pride themselves on industrial efficiency, we must still stagger along with a rickety, wasteful, and completely unfair method of filling the ranks of the Army.

Why, I ask Mr. McNamara, has not the same attention gone into the human component of your Department that apparently goes into your decisions relating to weapons systems? Does not American industry require efficient use of people just as much as efficient use of machinery, or in this case, of weapons and supplies? Is it possible, Mr. Secretary, that manpower utilization has a low level of priority simply because with the draft in effect, it is possible to bring in however many men are needed without regard to efficiency?

In the last 4 years, I have seen absolutely nothing to restore my confidence that the draft law is really needed. It remains the manpower crutch of the Army alone, not the Air Force, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. The Pentagon can always come to Congress with extensive proof that a substantial pay raise is needed, as it is doing again this year. But where are the studies that will eliminate the criticisms of the inefficient use of drafted men by the Army that were voiced by the Cordiner report and by many other reports?

I submit that I know something about "featherbedding" and "work rules" in industry, and I think it is about time the Sec-

retary of Defense provided some real "work rules" for the Army in the interest of efficiency, as well as in the interest of the young men who are now subject to the lottery of selective service.

Since there is no opportunity to vote for a 2-year extension with a manpower review, I therefore cast my vote against another 4 years of selective service.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senate in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate now returns to the morning hour, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senator from Mississippi recognized?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Is not the Senate in the morning hour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is, for the moment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor with the understanding that I will be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour.

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

WHAT GOES ON?—BAY OF PIGS
INCIDENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am fully aware that the problem of a Soviet military presence in Cuba and what to do about it far outweighs past mistakes and what really happened at the Bay of Pigs. I am also aware of the fact that only the administration can provide the action and the answers required to meet the current threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere. But I certainly do not agree with the administration spokesmen who argue that because we have a danger-fraught situation existing 90 miles off the southern coast of America we must declare a complete moratorium on all discussion of one of the blackest episodes in American history. As I have pointed out before on this floor, it was not the Republicans or the critics of the New Frontier who reopened the public discussion of the Bay of Pigs fiasco—rather, it was reopened by the Attorney General of the United States, who enjoys the unique status of being the President's brother and one of the three men appointed by the President to conduct an official post-mortem on the ill-fated invasion attempt in April of 1961.

Since the Attorney General saw fit to reopen this discussion by providing a selected group of reporters with his personal version, I believe those interested in the full and truthful facts attendant to the Bay of Pigs incident have both

the right and the duty to demand an accurate accounting to the public.

Mr. President, I am confident that it will do no good for those in official positions to keep telling us that we should stop talking about the Bay of Pigs or the Cuba story. The reason is—and we have only to look at the daily newspaper to understand this—that the American people will not stop talking about it. And all the exhortations of the Vice President and majority leader will not stop them or the opposition. To them, the administration's supersecret attitude on this official failure has become something in the nature of a "whodunit" which they want solved.

Mr. President, I am again forced to ask "What goes on?" Why cannot the American people be given a complete, unvarnished version of the events that occurred back in April of 1961? Why must we keep getting the details of those events piecemeal from obscure sources? Why must we go constantly to the newspapers and the magazines for more enlightenment?

In this connection, I recommend to the Senate some required reading. My reference is to an article in the March 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting."

Now, Mr. President, this magazine has had a record of accuracy and consistency in the reporting of emergent facts concerning the Bay of Pigs. And for that reason, I believe some of the statements made in this article should be answered by the administration. They suggest a much heavier American involvement in the Cuban invasion attempt than any of us heretofore have suspected. Some of the disclosures I have never seen before in any official or unofficial statement or any printed versions of the Bay of Pigs episode. For example, let me quote some of the statements made in this article:

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight deck, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught by chance in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a plane of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the

beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over the American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day of the invasion—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and a copilot, were in a C-54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B-26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro's jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene, not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B-26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

Mr. President, if this report be true in part or full, I believe the administration owes it to the American people to give us a full and complete rundown on just what occurred at the Bay of Pigs. In light of the Attorney General's insistence that no American air cover was ever planned for the Cuban invaders, it would help to know what, if the report is true, was the meaning of the Navy jets with their insignia painted out? Why was an aircraft carrier standing by with her jets ready, if the report is true? What were the Cuban invaders led to believe about American support? These questions have been begging for answers too long. The American people have a right to know.

I ask unanimous consent to have the U.S. News & World Report article reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

BAY OF PIGS: THE CURTAIN IS LIFTING

(NOTE.—That clamp of secrecy on what happened at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, just will not stay put. Information keeps leaking out. Now it shows: Americans were in far deeper than officials admit. And U.S. air power was ready to go on a moment's notice.)

More and more details are breaking through the curtain of secrecy to show how deeply Americans were involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight decks, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

American frogmen scouted the beaches in advance of the attack. American combat veterans flew B-26 bombers into the battle zone and piloted planes carrying Cuban paratroopers who were dropped in advance of infantrymen.

None of these men were members of the regular U.S. Armed Forces, although several were Air National Guardsmen. All were vol-

unteers. But after word got out that four American pilots died in combat at the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy said this at his news conference on March 6:

"Let me just say about these four men: They were serving their country."

How United States helped: These details can now be told.

In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-Day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught, by chance, in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a planeload of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over an American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and copilot, were in a C-54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B-26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B-26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

U.S. B-26 pilots hired: On March 7, 1963, the Chicago Sun-Times reported that Air National Guard pilots from Alabama, Arkansas, and Virginia, "were offered \$2,500 a month by the Central Intelligence Agency to take part in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961." The newspaper said pilots from the three States were "sought out because the Guard units of those States were the last to fly the B-26 bombers used in the invasion. The World War II bomber was retired from the State units in 1959."

The Chicago American identified Brig. Gen. George Reid Doster of the Alabama Air National Guard as tactical commander of the anti-Castro force. General Doster refused to confirm or deny the report, but indicated he would like to tell his story to a congressional committee. He said: "I wish they would call me and let me put my feet on a desk and talk for about 8 hours."

It had been reported earlier by U.S. News & World Report that at least 18 American airmen went to Guatemala to train Cuban pilots of the B-26 bomber fleet that the invaders had assembled. These men were recruited for combat duty. Later their orders were changed, limiting them to the role of instructors. But when things started to go wrong at the Bay of Pigs, those who wanted to be permitted to go on combat missions. At least 10, maybe more, did so.

There still is no public report by the administration on how many Americans were involved in the invasion, or what they did. But gradually, after 2 years of silence, some of those Americans are beginning to tell their experiences. And as their accounts are pieced together, the curtain of secrecy is lifting from the Bay of Pigs.

WASHINGTON VOGUE OF PLANNED PERMANENT DEFICITS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, on February 21, the Wall Street Journal contained a very interesting article about the current "Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits." This article points out an interesting fact which many may have overlooked in the present controversy being waged on the Federal level about the budget. That fact is simply this: Considerable importance is still attached on the State and local levels to budget balancing.

The people more closely connected with the State and local budgets, Mr. President, are the ones who are much closer to the people than any of us here in the Congress of the United States.

This excellent article continues by pointing out, however, that there still is considerable concern in the Congress about the Federal deficit way of life. And I believe there is no Member of Congress more concerned with this present situation than TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, ranking Republican member of the Joint Economics Committee.

Representative CURTIS is a man who is outrightly proud of his Puritan ethics, and he has remained close enough to his constituents in Missouri to know that his people—and people throughout the country—will not be taken in by the New Frontier's so-called new economy talk.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee myself, I can personally attest to the ability and dedication of our conscientious ranking minority member. All of us bow to his knowledge at one time or another, and I deem it a privilege to serve with Representative CURTIS on the Joint Economic Committee. I particularly would commend him on his questioning of witnesses in our recent hearings.

This Wall Street Journal article brings out clearly Mr. CURTIS' opinion about what will happen to the economy and the budget if the administration's plans are followed, as well as other interesting facts so important to all of us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

OF MINDS AND BUDGETS

A curious thing about the Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits is that it is still not accepted by a number of other governmental entities in managing their own affairs.

No matter how much phoniness may go into some State and local budget-balancing acts, considerable importance is nonetheless attached to the principle. The giants of California and New York, which sometimes seem to be racing each other in spending as well as population, try to keep up the appearance of balanced books. Even New York City does so; an unplanned deficit is regarded as a fiscal crisis.

This suggests that State and local politicians, closer to the people than Washington's "new" economists are, realize the voters wouldn't care for a different policy. The politicians themselves would doubtless feel

guilty about deliberately planning big deficits year in and year out. So it is a bit puzzling why what is considered sound policy and politics in certain important governmental units is flouted by the biggest of all.

Actually, plenty of concern can be found in Congress, as in the country, about the Federal deficit way of life. Perhaps as a result, even some administration spokesmen are beginning to sound a little defensive about it—which may or may not be an encouraging sign.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, for one, told the House Ways and Means Committee that the current hope is to achieve a balanced budget in the fiscal period beginning 3 years from this summer. That's a good way off, but at least the man mentioned the possibility.

With that in mind, Mr. Gordon said any tax cuts should be accompanied by efforts to hold down the Government's spending for purposes other than defense and space.

Savings could be made, he indicated, through such means as switching from direct Government loans to private credit whenever possible and generally lowering Government costs and raising efficiency through better management. In addition, of course, the tax cuts themselves are supposed to stimulate the economy so that it will produce much bigger Federal revenues from the lower rates.

If all this is how the Government proposes to balance the budget in some remote future, we fear it adds up to a feeble effort.

Even if some savings attempts were made, and pursued diligently, they could not offset deficits estimated at nearly \$9 billion in this fiscal year and nearly \$12 billion in the next and Heaven knows what thereafter. And the hope of stimulation through tax cuts, which must deepen deficits initially at least, is hardly enhanced by the complexity and lethargic pace of the proposed program.

No wonder Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, told Mr. Gordon he thinks administration economy talk "isn't going to be believed by the people"; the administration's first 3 fiscal years will have seen a spending rise of around \$17 billion. With rising spending and lower taxes, Mr. CURTIS estimated the budget couldn't be balanced until fiscal 1972. For all we know, that may be unduly optimistic.

It certainly can't be balanced until the administration gives convincing proof of abandoning its fetish of deficits of indefinite duration. Almost everybody else in the country knows that running constantly in the red, whether in a family, a business, a local or a national government, is a policy of folly.

As the International Monetary Fund's managing director, Per Jacobsson, put it, the notion that there should be permanently unbalanced budgets strikes him as "the emanation of permanently unbalanced minds."

Balancing the budget is necessary not for the sake of appearance but for the sake of the integrity of the Nation's financial foundations. In Washington as elsewhere, integrity is the key to all. It is the key the people and the Congress must persuade the Government to find.

WALTER LIPPMANN TELLS "THE STORY OF THE CONGO"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have the privilege of bringing to the attention of Senators a most perceptive article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Story of the Congo." The article appeared in the March 4 issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the

conclusion of my remarks. The article should serve to remind us of the troubled past of the Congo as well as of the tremendous efforts which are required in order to put this richly endowed African country on the road to ordered progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking in an entirely different context—and for the purpose of discrediting U.S. policy in Europe—Pravda of March 11 called Walter Lippmann the "dean of Washington journalism" and conceded that he is a "man who is not customarily given to hyperbole." While rejecting the purpose for which these words are used, I agree wholeheartedly with this apt description of an outstanding American commentator.

The fact is, Mr. President, that in the Newsweek article referred to, Mr. Lippmann has accurately traced the difficulties which beset the Congo immediately following Belgium's grant of independence in 1960. He also makes the very important point that President Eisenhower suggested that Patrice Lumumba turn for assistance to the United Nations rather than rely upon the intervention of American troops to save the Congo from a complete breakdown of law and order. Let those who still question the wisdom of our Congo policy remember that the United Nations has done us the inestimable service of preventing a direct United States-Soviet confrontation in the Congo. It forestalled a situation in which Americans would have performed police functions in the heart of Africa. Either course might have entailed disastrous consequences. In retrospect, as in 1960, I am heartily thankful that the former President of the United States took his wise decision.

Finally, Walter Lippmann gives a brief but telling account of the vital technical and educational services being performed by U.N. and Belgian personnel in the Congo today. We must remember that the Congo today needs first, educated citizens; second, competent and trained administrators; third, engineers and technicians to solve the manifold problems of disrupted or nonexistent public services; fourth, a buoyant economy and a market for the rich natural resources of the country; fifth, and finally, the firmest of links with Western Europe.

In this connection, the Belgians have an all-important role to play. I am pleased to note that they are playing this role—both in their own interests and in the interests of a viable Congo. Not all Belgian businessmen have horns on their heads. Even the mighty Union Miniere is not the archenemy that it was frequently depicted during the Katangan secession. Honesty compels us to recognize that the Congo and Belgium have organic ties which should bind them for years to come. I am glad that Walter Lippmann has indicated the importance of this new relationship between a former colony and its former

colonial rulers. I am pleased that he has stressed the role of the U.N. in helping the Congo through the hard days that lie ahead.

EXHIBIT I

WALTER LIPPMANN ON THE STORY OF THE CONGO

No one in our time is likely to be happy about the Congo. For it presents a problem which has no quick and obvious solution. What the U.N. has done in the Congo and what the United States has done in the U.N. can be judged properly only if we begin with the basic fact—that the Congo is a large, rich, independent state which is not now prepared to govern itself without outside help.

When people say that the U.N. did not originally contemplate any such large military and technical operation, they are quite right. The authors of the charter in 1945 did not foresee the situation of the Congo in 1960 or what would happen when the old colonial empires were liquidated. There was, as I recall it, a vague assumption that the colonies would be liberated eventually after the imperial rulers had educated them for self-government, as the British had done in India and the Americans in the Philippines. Insofar as any thought was given to the problem, this was to be the model for the liberation of the other colonies.

But in fact the Belgians did not follow that model in the Congo, and the Portuguese are not following it now in what is probably a second Congo—namely, Angola. The controlling fact in the Congo is that it received political independence without adequate preparation.

There was no university in the Congo until 1954, and only a handful of Congolese received European university training. When independence came in 1960 there were only about 30 Congolese university graduates. As late as 1958, only about 18,000 Congolese, out of a population of over 13 million, were attending academic secondary schools. The Belgians prided themselves on the primary and vocational education and the health services of the Congo. It was not an idle boast to say that the Belgian Congo was a showcase colony. But a colony and only a colony it was until the day it was liberated.

Too much, too soon: Naturally we ask ourselves whether independence could not have been delayed. The Belgian Government did not think so. After the riots in Leopoldville in January 1959, the Belgians accepted the idea of eventual independence. Then, under the pressure of the Congolese leaders, Belgium conceded independence for June 30, 1960. This was, of course, much too soon. For there were almost no safety valves, that is to say preparatory steps for independence.

The crucial event occurred 6 days after independence when the uneducated Congolese troops mutinied against their Belgian officers. The mutiny was followed by atrocities, by the flight of Europeans and by the occupation of the key cities by Belgian paratroopers against the wishes of the Central Government. It was in this chaos that the Congo Government appealed to the United States for troops.

President Eisenhower's reply to this appeal was decisive for the whole future. He declined to send American troops and he advised the Congolese to appeal to the United Nations. That is how the U.N. got into the Congo in the first place.

The U.N. was not pushed into the Congo by the Afro-Asian bloc. President Eisenhower did not turn to the U.N. because he was stary-eyed about the U.N. and about the Congo but because the only alternative was American intervention. That, considering all of our other involvements all over the world, would have been, to say the least,

imprudent. And to have done nothing would have virtually guaranteed the Russians an invitation to help force out the unwanted Belgians.

The education gap: This background is essential to anyone who wishes to think clearly and fairly about what has been done in the Congo and what will have to be done. The story shows that, with the end of the secession of Katanga, the problem of the Congo is the lack of officials, military officers, technicians, and teachers. Until that lack is made up by the education of the Congolese, which will take at least a generation, many positions in public and private services will have to be filled by outsiders and some authority outside the Congo will have to help maintain law and order.

That is the job which the U.N. and the Belgians have already begun, and it should go forward rapidly now that the civil war is over. Some 2,000 Congolese are in U.N.-sponsored training programs. The U.N. has provided a thousand foreign teachers and technical experts, and Belgium is giving the services of 2,000 trained people—teachers, doctors, agricultural experts. Altogether 40,000 Belgians are in the Congo, mostly in business, helping to develop the country.

If the U.N. can provide the authority and protection the Congo needs, keeping the services of the foreigners and providing the additional technical help necessary for its development, it will have a success which could not have been achieved by any other authority in the whole world.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of March 13 Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, our representative at the United Nations, appeared before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The chairman of the meeting was the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. The meeting was very well attended by members of the full committee.

Adlai Stevenson gave to us a complete and comprehensive report of the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the role of our country in that session.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson is one which I think ought to be read by every Member of the Senate. Indeed, the entire transcript of the hearing, which is far more detailed than the prepared statement by the Ambassador, should be "must" reading for every Member of Congress, and for every interested citizen.

Adlai Stevenson described the work of the United Nations in very measured and careful terms, neither exaggerating its importance nor underplaying its significance.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson, particularly as it relates to the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations is to my mind very worthwhile reading and of great importance to every Member of the Senate, for we are all concerned about our international relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement by Mr. Stevenson may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 13, 1963

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the United Nations is a big subject—one which can be approached from many points of view. From one point of view it is a symbol of the aspirations of most of humanity for peace, decency, and human dignity. From another point of view it is an institution of 110 members pioneering the arts of parliamentary diplomacy on a near-universal level. From still another, it is a very large operating mechanism performing such varied activities as stopping a war, spraying tropical villages with DDT to combat malaria, and drafting a convention on some aspect of human rights. There is even a point of view—albeit a narrow one—from which the United Nations appears to be the symbol of wicked one-worldness, a sinister threat to the national sovereignty, and a joint convention of international do-gooders and bobby-soxers.

So like a novelist approaching some universal theme, anyone preparing to say or write something about the United Nations must somehow come to grips with his material, determine his point of view, decide where to focus—what to put in and what to leave out. In the process, many arbitrary choices must be made.

My arbitrary choice for this occasion—which I hope will meet with your approval—is to focus briefly but sharply on this question: how and to what extent does our membership in the United Nations serve the foreign policy interests of the United States of America? Or, more crudely, what's in it for us?

I make no apology to the most sensitive supporter of the United Nations for phrasing it that way. After all, if the very considerable effort and time and money which we have invested in the United Nations has not been a good investment from the U.S. point of view, then we should say so and behave accordingly—as, I feel sure, every other Member does.

I shall try to test this question of what's in it for us against two criteria: first against the record of the 17th General Assembly which had just over 100 items on its agenda; and second, against the roles of the U.N. in two of the greatest crises of recent history—the collapse of the Congo and the discovery of Soviet missile bases in Cuba. These are tough tests: one covers a virtual compendium of the on-going problems which beset the modern world; the other raises specific issues of peace and war in specific areas at specific times.

But before coming to these two tests of how well or how badly our membership in the U.N. serves the national interest, it is worthwhile to pose a prior test: is the United Nations relevant to the real world of the second half of the 20th century? For if the United Nations does not reflect the real world, it is unlikely to be able to do anything useful about it.

What then are the dominant factors that make the real world what it is in the second half of the 20th century? I think we can limit ourselves to brief mention of five dominant facts of life in our tumultuous times?

First is the great confrontation which goes under the name of the East-West conflict or the cold war—and the nuclear arms race which is its most dangerous manifestation. This has brought into conflict two sets of ideas about the value of human dignity which cannot be bridged philosophically. It also has brought into conflict two

great and powerful nations whose national differences must be bridged politically if either is to survive. The proceedings of the United Nations consistently reflect both aspects of this so-called East-West confrontation.

The second factor dominating contemporary history is the revolutionary wave of national independence which, in an incredibly short period, has brought political independence to nearly one billion people, leaving less than 2 percent of the former colonial peoples in dependent status—an historic convulsion which perhaps offered communism its greatest opportunity to absorb vast areas of the world. The United Nations itself administered a number of these changes from dependent to independent status and is deeply involved with the difficult and emotional final stage of liquidating the old colonial system and the race problems embedded in it.

The third factor is the so-called revolution of rising expectations, which has put a spotlight on the glaring gap between the material conditions of the rich minority and the poor majority among the world's peoples. Some 85 percent of the entire staffs of the U.N. system is occupied with the first systematic effort at international cooperation in the field of economic and social affairs—certainly one of the great phenomena of contemporary times.

Fourth is the fantastic pace of discovery and invention—which romps ahead oblivious to the political and social consequences and which makes the demands for a decent life for all a practical proposition for the first time in history. The United Nations is concerned increasingly with the complex and little-understood problems of how to transfer effectively science and technology from one cultural setting to another.

Fifth is the fitful emergence of a restless, teeming, volatile, frequently quarrelsome open society of nation-states—a society of enormous diversity of cultures, races and political, economic, and social systems. The United Nations is, of course, the institutional center of this open international society—partly the cause and partly the result of the forces which impel an inter-dependent world into more intimate association on an expanding agenda of political and human problems.

If these are the principal factors which mold our times—the cold war, the liquidation of colonialism, the pervasive demand for a better material way of life, the thundering impact of science, and the emergence of a vast, new open society on the international plans—then we must conclude that the United Nations is indeed relevant to these times—that it is part and parcel of the contemporary scene. And being relevant, it is theoretically in a position to be effective.

Let us come, then, to the question of how effective from our point of view. What's in it for us? How—as the most recent example—does the record of the 17th General Assembly stand the test?

I said a moment ago that the agenda of the 17th General Assembly was a virtual compendium of the on-going problems of the modern world.

Listen to this list of trouble spots and sore spots: the Congo, the Gaza Strip, southern Rhodesia, southwest Africa, the Portuguese African territories, Kashmir, Yemen, west New Guinea, and the Arab refugee camps.

Mark this string of contentious issues: Chinese representation, North Korea, Hungary, colonialism, trioka, and sovereignty over natural resources.

Consider this list of universal concerns: disarmament, nuclear testing, outer space, world food, world trade, world science, and the training of manpower for economic and social development.

All of these issues, in one form or another, came before the United Nations for some kind of action during the 17th General Assembly, even if each one did not appear formally on the Assembly's agenda. Many of them are among the most complex, the most intractable, the most ancient troubles of the human race. And many come to the United Nations as a court of last resort—because nobody else has been able to cope with them at all.

Obviously, the United Nations did not solve all, or many, of these problems; but it worked on them. On a few it took conclusive action; on some it made progress, and on others it did not.

We have made full reports on the record of the 17th General Assembly—item by item and vote by vote; I shall not take your time to repeat the record. The point to be made is simply this: the U.S. view was the majority view in over 80 percent of the 40 key votes cast in committees and full Assembly. On several issues we abstained, and on two extreme resolutions recommending sanctions against member states we voted against the majority.

This is the measure of the extent to which our membership in the United Nations served the foreign policy interests of the United States across the spectrum of issues represented by the agenda of the 17th General Assembly.

Meanwhile, the impact of the twin crises in the Caribbean and the Himalayas raised our credit—and our credibility; had the opposite effect on the stock of the Soviet Union; improved Western Hemisphere solidarity; activated the members from NATO; and gave pause to those who tend to equate the bona fides of the United States and the Soviet Union.

I am not saying for one moment that the 17th General Assembly—or any other meeting or organ of the United Nations—was the handmaiden of the Department of State. I am not even saying that there were no disappointments or no cause for apprehension: for example, we expect continuing fireworks over the hard core cases in the remnants of European empires, and we are most gravely concerned at the lack of evidence of financial responsibility on the part of all too many members. But I am saying, most emphatically, that in no case was U.S. interest damaged, in most cases our objectives were furthered in a positive fashion, and in other cases we have reason to hope for a better result on another day. In short, it was very much in our national interest to be there, paying our considerable share of the cost and exercising our considerable share of the leadership.

The political problems before the General Assembly tend to be those anguished issues which have roots in the past and drag on from year to year—so hardy or so virulent that sometimes our best efforts succeed only in keeping them from going from bad to worse.

But now I should like to discuss, if I may, two crises which had sudden beginnings, which directly and immediately involved the United Nations, and which now seem to be ended—at least in the form in which they arose. I refer to those most dangerous events which raised the dire threat of great power confrontation—and thus of war—in the Congo and the Caribbean. The point is to ask in each case whether the role of the United Nations in these crises served the foreign policy interests of the United States.

What were our aims in the Congo affair? Our aims in the Congo are the same as our aims for all of tropical Africa. They are quite simple to state: to help create an area of truly free and independent African states, safe from external aggression or subversion, working out their own destinies in their own way, cooperating with each other and with those who wish to help in their overwhelming task of progressive modernization. In

the Congo, as elsewhere, this requires national unity and a reasonable degree of political stability.

Contrasted to this, the collapse of the Congo in its first week of nationhood offered these sudden prospects: national disunity, political chaos, civil disorder, social disintegration, and external penetration—prospects made to order for Communist exploitation. And because of this, the ultimate prospect for the Congo was for the forces of the nuclear powers to find themselves face to face in the heart of central Africa in the infancy of independence—about as messy and dangerous a state of affairs as one can imagine.

The story of the struggle of the United Nations—with unflinching support from this country—to bring order out of chaos in the Congo is too well known to members of this committee to review it here. I am all too conscious of every bit and every kind of criticism that has been leveled against this operation; and it has been of every kind—from honest doubts about the legal basis for U.N. action to purple propaganda and outrageous lies. I also will state that in this unprecedented, almost fantastic operation, some decisions were not perfectly coordinated, some operations were not fully efficient, some judgments were not later justified, and a few actions were not excusable. My point is neither to tabulate the accomplishments nor to count the mistakes.

My point is, rather, to look at the results and state that, as of today, civil war has been replaced by national unity, political chaos has been replaced by reasonable prospects for political stability, total disorder has been replaced by order, social disintegration has been replaced by an evolving program for social progress, and the scavengers have been sent home packing. None of this is yet guaranteed to be permanent. But this is what has happened in the Congo; this is what the United States wanted to happen in the Congo; and it could not have happened under any other auspices than that of the United Nations.

It therefore is difficult—indeed it is impossible—to avoid the conclusion that the foreign policy interests of the United States have been served well by the United Nations performance in the Congo crisis—and this, of course, would have been out of the question without our membership and our full support. I know no way of putting a dollar value on the restoration of peace in central Africa.

The U.N. role in the Congo was, of course, an extremely large operational task, involving nearly 20,000 troops from 21 nations, supported by a massive airlift, and by hundreds of civilian technicians recruited through a dozen international agencies.

The U.N. role in the Cuban crisis was entirely different. Actually, the U.N. had three roles in the Cuban crisis—two of which were played out while the third was frustrated but nonetheless useful to us. Because the naval quarantine of Cuba was the first dramatic move in that crisis, and because of the critical part played by the Organization of American States, it is easy to forget how the United Nations fitted into the pattern of these supercharged days when the world stood at the edge of the abyss in late October.

You will remember, of course, that the President called into play at one stroke all the available instruments of diplomatic action—U.S. military power, the Organization of American States, the United Nations, and an appeal to public opinion around the world.

The first role of the United Nations was to serve as a world forum where the facts could be laid on the table. When the Security Council met in emergency session, I was able to present the U.S. case not only to the members of that Council, but to all other members of the United Nations who crowded the tense

room, as well as to the press and microphones and the cameras which carried our story to our own public and to every corner of the world reached by the mass media of today. Our case was right; our case was thoroughly documented; and our case was vastly strengthened as it unfolded before the bar of world opinion in the Security Council of the U.N.—the only bar of universal public opinion there is. Just how much this revelation of Soviet deceit and recklessness shocked the innocent bystanders in the cold war, I can't guess. Nor, of course, can I estimate how much this blow to confidence in Russia's word and influence among the new nations contributed to Mr. Khrushchev's decision to pull out quickly and make the best of a bad mistake.

The second role of the United Nations—or, more precisely, of the Secretary General of the United Nations—was that of third party to the issue. At a critical moment—when the nuclear powers seemed to be set on a collision course—the Secretary General's intervention led to the diversion of the Soviet ships headed for Cuba and interception by our Navy. This was an indispensable first step in the peaceful resolution of the Cuban crisis. The mere existence of an impartial office which could perform such a service in the middle of the night at such a time, is no small asset to the human race.

The third role of the United Nations in the Cuban crisis—the one which could not be played out—was that of an international inspector ready and willing to go at once to Cuba to verify the removal of the missiles. As we all know, Castro refused a United Nations presence on Cuban soil—and so prevented a quicker and a cleaner liquidation of the crisis. But the fact is that at the height of the most dangerous crisis of the postwar world, Chairman Khrushchev agreed—even proposed—an international inspection team under United Nations auspices, a proposal to which we could quickly agree and which became part of the formula for disengagement between the United States and Soviet heads of state. And Castro's refusal of U.N. inspection converted a quarrel between the Soviet Union and the United States into a defiance of the United Nations by Cuba.

Finally, and I won't detain you longer on this subject, the United Nations provided a site where Mr. McCloy and I could meet with Mr. Kuznetsov and the Soviet negotiators for those long weeks to conclude the transaction.

Mr. Chairman, I should not care to speculate on how or when the Cuban crisis might have been resolved—or whether it could have been resolved—without the United Nations. But I do say that the United Nations played a large part in a complex exercise in diplomatic action which averted the threat of thermonuclear war; and for this I think we can thank our stars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have put the record of the United Nations at the 17th General Assembly, during the Congo crisis, and during the Cuban crisis, to the test; and we have seen that, in very large measure, the performance of the U.N. served well the foreign policy interests of the United States. There was, indeed, much in it for us.

But I should prefer, in the end, not to read that record as though it were a score board on which victories and defeats are recorded. I prefer to avoid the specious habit of treating the course of human affairs—even the massive conflicts in world affairs—like some sporting event which ends when the timekeeper blows his whistle.

The real world of international politics is not that simple. We are dealing with fitful tides of history which ebb and flow. We are wrestling often with problems which, when solved in their immediate forms, promptly give rise to new forms and new problems—as witness the case of the Congo today.

We can, of course, say with assurance that, in this case or that, our policies prevailed and our objectives were gained. We can point to objective proof of progress here and there. We can show that unfriendly moves X and Y were defeated or diverted—and that in all of these cases the United Nations had a useful part to play.

But to form mature judgments as to the real value of the United Nations to the interests of the United States, it seems to me that we must raise alternatives—that we must ask questions which challenge the imagination to say what might have happened if the United Nations had not been there at all. For example:

Would the Communists have fared better or worse in their efforts to divert the independence movement into a Communist mold—their supreme opportunity to extend power—if the United Nations had not existed?

Would the prospects of peace be better or worse—in Iran, in Greece, in Korea, in Kashmir, in the Middle East, in the Western Pacific, in central Africa—if there had been no United Nations during the past decade and a half?

Would U.S. foreign policy interests in the Congo and the Caribbean have been served better or worse without a United Nations during the past few months?

Could the United States put its ideas, its beliefs, its policies before the watching world more—or less—effectively if the United Nations did not exist?

I shall not attempt to speculate on these alternatives for, it seems to me, the questions answer themselves.

But I should like to conclude my remarks with a few comments about the position of those who favor the United Nations in principle but want to withdraw or restrict our support on those relatively few occasions when the United States finds itself in a minority position.

The basic point here, of course, is that the United States does not own or control the United Nations. We are no more and no less than the most influential of the 110 members. If we were less we would be failing to exert the influence of freedom's leader; if we were more we would destroy the effectiveness of the U.N., which depends precisely on the fact that it is not an arm of the United States or of any other government, but a truly international organization—no better or worse than the agreements which can be reached by the controlling majorities of its members.

Before such agreements are reached—or not reached—debate and negotiation bare differences and reveal similarities which frequently lead to accommodation and compromise. And I ask: Is this not the heart of the democratic method? Is this not the parliamentary system in action? Is this not our own idea of how we are most likely to make more wise decisions than foolish ones—how the weak are most likely to be protected from the strong—how the will of the majority and the rights of the minority can both find expression without injustice to either?

The answer to these questions is "Yes." And if we were to pick up our marbles and go home whenever there is a disappointment, we would not only destroy the effectiveness of the U.N. but would abandon hope that nations can work out their problems most of the time by the same methods by which conflicting interests get resolved within democratic nations and communities. This would deny on the international level the principles, methods, and techniques which we swear by on the national and local levels.

Even faith in our kind of institutions would not, however, be enough to justify support for the United Nations if it worked against us. But this dilemma does not exist, and the record proves it. The fact is that the story of the last General Assembly—when

the U.S. position was the majority position better than four times out of five—is the standard story of succeeding Assemblies over the past decade and a half. The fact is that in 17 years the Soviet Union has never once succeeded in building a majority for any proposition of substance against the opposition of the United States. And the fact is that in 17 years the United States has never felt obliged to exercise the veto in the Security Council to protect its interest, and the Soviet Union has vetoed 100 times.

That's the record and there is a fundamental reason for it. The reason should be recalled frequently—for in this fact lies one of our greatest assets in the world today: The fact that the foreign policy interests of the United States are generally in harmony with the foreign policy interests of all nations which want to see a peaceful community of independent states working together, by free choice, to improve the lot of humanity. And since the majority of the nations of the world shares this goal, the majority consistently sides with the United States—or we side with them, depending on your point of view—when the roll is called and the yeas and nays are counted. It's as simple as that.

But let us take a couple of blemishes in the record and the performance of the U.N. and its members—the kind of blemishes that lead some of our people who favor the U.N. in principle to want to restrict it in practice.

First, take a case where the United States could not agree with a majority of the decisionmaking group in a U.N. agency. A recent case was the decision of the United Nations Special Fund to help finance an agricultural research project in Cuba. We objected to that project and still do. Yet the whole story is that out of 288 projects assisted by that fund, in the course of its existence, we approved of 287. So we face a choice: should we retaliate by withholding or limiting our support for an agency which we invented, which has allocated 97 percent of its funds to nations which we ourselves are aiding, and which represents an economical way for the United States to contribute to the decade of development because in 1 out of 288 instances we were unable to persuade a majority that our view was the correct one?

Let me refer also to a situation which seems to agitate some of our people—the fact that the Soviet Union does not make the voluntary contributions which it is well able to make to such programs as technical assistance, the Special Fund, malaria eradication, the world food program, and so forth. Their delinquency is deplorable but understandable from their point of view. These programs do not serve Communist ends; on the contrary. So it is hardly surprising that the Soviet Union makes little or no voluntary contributions to agencies whose work cuts straight across their own objectives. But should we support these programs less because they fail to win applause from the Kremlin?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I rather suspect that the Soviet Union and other Communist countries will tend to participate—and contribute—somewhat more in the work of these agencies in the years to come. There is some evidence of that already. And I think that the reason is clear. The policy of self-ostracism from the specialized agencies has not worked well for the Soviet Union, even though it has made life with them a bit easier for us.

If this in fact happens, it will raise some day-to-day problems for us but, in my view, it also will raise problems for them and opportunities for us. For while the so-called Communist states operate more or less closed societies at home, once they step out into a United Nations forum they enter an open society.

In an open forum, over a period of time, ideology becomes transparent, dogma wears this and becomes tiresome, and the myth of the magical solution evaporates slowly in the free air of a marketplace of ideas. There is contention in all this; there is frustration and the stuff of headlines; there is danger that the fearful and the insecure will want to withdraw from the free interplay of conflicting ideas and concepts and terminology—especially if, now and again, things do not go exactly the way we would like them to.

Yet it is we who do best in the open forum—for this is our natural habitat. And if we have the nerve to go ahead—if we have the stomach for the test of the open society—if we have the courage to build even that which is not perfect from our point of view—I can foresee nothing but a more meaningful dialog coming out of it, a gradual erosion of tension, and finally the dominance of a set of ideas which are better—and better able to stand the test—than the Marxist ideas as revealed to his successors.

All this would require, on our part, a degree of responsibility, of restraint, of maturity, and of political sophistication which never before has been demanded of a democratic public and its elected representatives. It will not be easy and it will not be without temporary disappointments; but I, for one, have no doubt of the outcome—for this, too, would serve and serve well the foreign policy interests of the United States of America.

"THE VIEW FROM THE HIGHWAY"—SENATOR NEUBERGER STATES THE NEED FOR BILLBOARD CONTROL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by my colleague Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER of Oregon, entitled "The View from the Highway" which was published in the March 1963 issue of *Country Beautiful*.

Senator NEUBERGER's article details the fight for adequate billboard control legislation. It was a pleasure to work with her in the previous session of Congress in enacting legislation to extend for 2 years the period in which the States might elect to participate in billboard controls in the Federal National Defense Interstate Highway System. To date 17 States, including Kentucky and Oregon, have billboard control legislation and the States will receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent for such controls. I note that the present law permitting States to participate in this program expires on July 1, 1963, and I know that numerous State legislatures are presently considering their States' participation.

Senator NEUBERGER writes in her article:

To erase the harsh picture of an America with an automobile-based economy that disregards esthetics is the objective of all billboard control legislation. We have learned that "a thing of beauty" is not a joy forever and the words of one of our great ballads may become meaningless unless we hurry.

That ballad sings of "purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain," and I like to think of schoolchildren throughout our land joining in that psalm and to know that as they take to the open road they will find the land they sing of stretching out from every town and city.

Mr. President, I salute the junior Senator from Oregon for her fine article which I commend to my colleagues.

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

THE VIEW FROM THE HIGHWAY—AMERICA'S NEWEST ROADS ARE IN DANGER OF BECOMING CORRIDORS LINED WITH BILLBOARDS IF THE STATES DO NOT SOON TAKE ADVANTAGE OF FEDERAL LAW

(By MAURINE B. NEUBERGER)

(NOTE.—MAURINE B. NEUBERGER was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1960 to fill the unexpired term of her husband, the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger. She was reelected recently and serves as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

Since the vast Interstate Highway System was inaugurated by Congress in 1956, 17 States have taken advantage of a special provision of the Federal-Aid Highway Act which gives additional money to those States which meet specified standards for control of billboards along their roadways. During the current legislative sessions it is hoped that even more will take action to qualify for this bonus award before the provision expires in June 1963.

To start with, it must be realized that it is the motorist's money which makes the billboard of value. If the highway were not there, the sign would not be worth a Continental dollar. The highway, paid for by the motorist with his various taxes, makes valuable the signboard which the motorist is forced to look at while traveling through the land. Surely our Federal and State Governments owe it to the touring public to keep the magnificent American outdoors from being scarred and marred by a vast jungle of billboards. But the signboard companies can lobby individual legislators whether at the State capitol or Washington, D.C., while there is no one to lobby for the motoring public except the Congress itself.

The first great travelers across our continent were Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, whom President Jefferson sent forth almost 160 years ago to see what lay beyond the Missouri River, which was then the limit of man's horizon.

Meriwether Lewis, who had been President Jefferson's private secretary, sent fabulous reports about what is now Oregon—its swift rivers, high mountains, deep harbors and riches in timber and pelts.

Captain Lewis wrote in his diary on Sunday, May 26, 1805, the day he glimpsed the highest mountain range in his native land: "I beheld the Rocky Mountains for the first time. * * * While I viewed these mountains I felt a secret pleasure."

Many areas of our country, whether mountain or prairie, lake or desert, make this enduring impression on residents and visitors alike, for nature covers all her works with a subtle quality that evokes a deep response in man.

It was to preserve a portion of that untouched and untrammeled America that Congress enacted in 1956 a \$41 billion Federal-Aid Highway Act and this began a new era of highway transportation. Streams of asphalt and concrete are pouring over the land and will eventually connect every corner of the country with modern, fast roads. A total of 41,000 miles of this network will constitute the National Interstate and Defense Highway System. This is a system of high-speed, limited-access, almost wholly four-lane separated roads, which will carry the bulk of the long-distance automobile and bus travel throughout our country.

The construction of these thousands of miles of new highways gives us two choices: The opportunity to preserve the esthetic as well as the merely economic values of travel

throughout our America, or the opportunity to provide valuable roadside accommodations for lanes of billboards.

The new highways, once built, will not be relocated in this generation. Unless we give thought now to the question of what the motorist is to see, as he cruises through the fields and forests and mountains and prairies of America, we know that it will be what he sees along other highways today: signs and billboards.

To put controls on certain advertising signs along the Interstate Highway System, the bonus award system was created after Congress passed a bill which was offered in January 1957 by my late husband, Senator Richard L. Neuberger. The bill also aimed at encouraging similar controls on lands adjacent to the national system.

Under this bill the Secretary of Commerce was directed to prepare a set of standard limitations on the erection of billboards to carry out a national policy of protecting scenic beauty as well as traffic safety along the Interstate System.

These standards are really recommendations and advisory for highways which are built on land under the control of the States. The bill does not force any State to accept these standards, if the government of the State does not want to do so. However, if the State complies with these standards and excludes commercial advertising billboards along its new, limited-access interstate highways, it will receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the roadbuilding moneys allocated to the State.

The standards themselves are to restrict signs within 650 feet of the right-of-way of the interstate highway to those necessary for highway information and directions, those advertising properties for sale adjacent to the highway and those advertising services to the motorist on premises which are adjacent to the highway.

The billboard industry failed to impress the Congress with the argument that it is performing a public service by preventing lazy motorists from falling asleep at the wheel, hypnotized by the natural scenery and the road. The industry's view seemed to imply that if the billboards were not there the driver might doze at the wheel because he would have nothing to look at except the spectacle of sky and mountain or lake and forest and waving fields of grain.

The billboard control bill specified that those States wishing to take advantage of the bonus provision must do so by July 1, 1961. At the urging of many roadside beautification groups and garden clubs, Congress later extended this deadline to July 1, 1963, so that more State legislatures could pass laws to meet the standards of the bills. It is doubtful, however, that Congress will again extend the bonus offer and many States will be without roadside protection unless they act immediately.

Though Oregon is one of the States which has met the standards promulgated by the Department of Commerce, this control measure applies to only 220 miles in the entire road system of over 10,000 miles in this Western State of large vistas and great open spaces. Civic-minded citizens, outdoor enthusiasts, and progressive State legislators were not satisfied with this meager effort and the State legislature saw the need to create a Scenic Area Commission to protect other highways and roadside areas from the inexorable encroachment of disfiguring billboards—billboards that seemed to creep across the land in competition with the creeping sand dunes along the Oregon coast.

In the legislative act, "scenic area" is defined as an area adjacent to a highway, within a park or having "a view of unusual natural beauty." To determine these areas a Commission was created having members representing varied interests such as labor, outdoor advertising and roadside services, as

well as members from motor clubs and the motoring public.

There has been no harsh ban against all billboards, either in the Federal act or the Oregon law; rather there has been a realistic recognition of the need for protection—protection that will enhance the value of the land through which the roadway passes by making attractive routes to beckon the tourist and traveler.

But the work of the Commission is fraught with frustrations and despair, as were the Members of Congress in setting up these desirable standards. Organized lobbies are at work constantly to throttle the legislatures, to influence the community, to present an extremely distorted picture of what a world without billboards would be like.

Those who scoff at Government interference in our way of life should ask themselves what the condition of our landscape would be if Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot had not called for Government preserves for our seemingly endless miles of standing timber. Some of the beauties of our waterfalls and national parks would not be here. If only ancient Lebanon had had a wise ruler to preserve the dense stands of the cedar that covered that land in Biblical days.

It is altogether fitting that the Congress and the States accept the principle of roadside protection and of preservation of scenic beauty in America through which a modern, efficient, high-speed Interstate Highway System will link this farflung Nation.

As we become more a nation of urban living, it is even more essential that we preserve some of America's natural beauty in our daily lives. The growth of the highway system, the development of storage dams creating lakes for boating and the reawakening of interest in our wilderness areas have created a whole new industry. Family trailers, small boats that can be easily transported behind the family car, convenience foods to take by pack into the high country—all these are taking the city family on a new trek 160 years after Lewis and Clark.

The highway protection legislation is still not "controlled" by faraway Washington. It has that magic phrase "States' rights" and leaves the choice entirely to the various State governments by offering assistance to those who wish to act. Ninety percent of the financing of the Interstate Highway System is done by the Federal Government. Is it unreasonable to protect this vast public investment by a slight additional offer of financial assistance to States which elect under their own State laws to safeguard roadside scenery along these new highways?

The limited-access nature of these transcontinental routes has been accepted by Congress without controversy although this has denied direct highway frontage to roadside businesses such as motels and restaurants. Should a special exception exist to permit one single roadside business—the billboard business of America—the privilege of direct access to travelers?

When the billboard control feature of the highway bill was debated in Congress, the opposition hurled the threat of "stifling private enterprise," yet it was pointed out that for many years outdoor signs have been effectively regulated in places extremely attractive to tourists, such as Hawaii, Alaska, and Switzerland.

The Federal Government is not a behemoth, wishing to exterminate an element of the business community—the outdoor advertising business. The State governments which have already accepted the bonus from the Federal Government for regulating signboards have provided for some outdoor advertising.

Few people would propose prohibiting billboards everywhere. In fact, there are many places in the cities and in the midst of industrial developments where they do not

seem out of place. Reasonable people do not object to outdoor advertising but they do object to it where it obstructs the scenic view or creates a traffic hazard. They accept the fact that signboards are here to stay.

From Maine to Oregon, I have seen evidence that the States are beginning to appreciate the resource that their highway system provides by their planting of trees, flowering shrubs and local native flora in the divider strips. At the exits there are beautifully landscaped areas covered with a variety of blooms from the raucous Scotch-broom in Oregon to the delicate pink azalea in Virginia.

This has led to an appreciation of the need for a respite for the traveler who welcomes, for safety as well as enjoyment after a day of driving, an attractive roadside rest and picnic area. At the turnoffs there may be established directional signs advising the motorist where to find food, lodging, and fuel in the area.

Day in and day out, every American is assailed by advertising from the moment he hears the morning news broadcast until he puts down his evening paper. Would it be such a sacrifice to let him escape even briefly when he takes to the open road to travel across the open country—the country which has fields and streams as well as factories and shacks that we have learned to describe as "America the beautiful?"

It isn't just the modern-day outdoor enthusiast who has taken up the cudgel for control of signboards. Mark Twain wrote of his experience in Switzerland in "A Tramp Abroad" in 1880:

"I was sitting on a bench inspecting, with strong interest, a noble monolith * * * a monolith not shaped by man, by Nature's free great hand—a massy pyramidal rock 80 feet high, devised by Nature 10 million years ago against the day when a man worthy of it should need it for his monument.

"It is said that 2 years ago a stranger let himself down from the top of it with ropes and pulleys, and painted all over it, in the big blue letters * * * these words: 'Buy Sun stove polish, try Benzaline for the blood.'

"He was captured, and it turned out that he was an American. Upon his trial the judge said to him:

"You are from a land where any insolent that wants to is privileged to profane and insult Nature, and, through her, Nature's God, if by so doing he can put a sordid penny in his pocket. But here the case is different. Because you are a foreigner and ignorant, I will make your sentence light; if you were a native, I would deal strenuously with you. Hear and obey—you will immediately remove every trace of your offensive work * * * you will pay a fine of 10,000 francs; you will suffer 2 years' imprisonment at hard labor; you will then be horsewhipped, tarred and feathered, deprived of your ears, ridden on a rail to the confines of the canton and banished forever. The severest penalties are omitted in your case—not as a grace to you, but to that great republic which had the misfortune to give you birth."

To erase the harsh picture of an America with an automobile-based economy that disregards esthetics is the objective of all billboard control legislation. We have learned that "a thing of beauty" is not a joy forever and the words of one of our great ballads may become meaningless unless we hurry.

That ballad sings of "purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain," and I like to think of schoolchildren throughout our land joining in that paean and to know that as they take to the open road they will find the land they sing of stretching out from every town and city.

PROTECTION OF POLICE OFFICERS FROM RECKLESS AND IRRESPONSIBLE CHARGES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Case of CORE and Officer Klimecke," published in the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1963. The editorial relates to the case of Officer Klimecke, who fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. The editorial comments on a telegram signed by Julius W. Hobson, president of the Committee on Racial Equality, and sent to the press.

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

THE CASE OF CORE AND OFFICER KLIMECKE

We have a few comments to make on the following telegram, signed "Julius W. Hobson, president" which the District of Columbia Commissioners received from CORE (Committee on Racial Equality), with copies sent to the newspapers by CORE.

"Murder of James Wall by untrained rookie policeman establishes need for immediate action to protect citizens of 10th precinct from police brutality. Officer Giles mentioned too frequently recently in connection with brutality and trigger-happy rookies should not be given guns before completing training. CORE demands new captain, lieutenants, and sergeants in 10th precinct, thorough investigation of brutality charges against policemen, and training program on relations with public. CORE suggests that both investigation and training program be conducted by persons not connected with police department. Also suggest thorough tests of emotional stability for recruits and periodically for all police."

Only one James Wall has been shot here. Only one policeman shot him. His name is Officer Frank Klimecke. (There was no "Officer Giles" involved.)

It seems to us that CORE and its officials are, quite likely, open for a suit of criminal libel. Officer Klimecke was doing his duty. CORE publicly calls it murder.

Policemen, it seems to us, should have the same protection from reckless and unproved charges as has the ordinary citizen, and have the same recourse to the courts when libeled.

The facts on record show Officer Klimecke fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. Colored witnesses support the policeman.

CORE goes on to refer to "trigger-happy rookies." Insofar as this might be supposed to refer to Officer Klimecke, we checked and learned that he served in France with the Army's military police for 3 years.

Nobody hates trigger-happy policemen more than we do. We hate them as much as we hate trigger-happy stickup men, or muggers who throttle peaceful citizens, or gangs (no matter how young they are) that beat people to death, or cowardly lifelong criminals—such as the one Officer Klimecke nailed—who ruthlessly attack defenseless women on the city's streets.

We hate them whether they are white or Negro, or whether their victims are white or Negro.

We'd like to think CORE shares our feelings, but we don't know.

We do know we don't share CORE's feelings about Officer Klimecke. Rather than denouncing him as a murderer, we think he deserves—if not a medal—at least a citation for doing his duty.

Neither do we share CORE's suggestion that the training of policemen should be

done by persons not connected with the Police Department. That's about as silly a notion as we've heard in some time.

CORE suggests there should be tests of emotional stability for recruits and, periodically, for all police. This is a good idea, but we thought we'd already heard of it somewhere. So we checked with the Police Department. CORE might be interested to know that this is already being done, and has been for years, by a trained psychiatrist.

Perhaps some of CORE's officials could profitably take similar tests for emotional stability, or lack of.

Racially oriented champions of less rigorous police safeguards for Washington overlook the fact that the respectable, law-abiding colored citizens are endangered as much or more than white citizens by a tiny tribe of almost hopelessly uncivilized brutes who can best be described as urban Mau Maus. This minuscule fraction of the city's population circulates in and out of our courts and jails, and causes nearly all the violent crime.

The great body of colored Washingtonians is, as is demonstrated every day, made up of upright, decent and law-abiding citizens. They suffer, along with the rest of us, from the depredations of this small group of habitually lawless primitives which can only be controlled by force.

The statistics to back these facts up are well known and easily proved. Rather than face them, CORE suggests another cat-hauling of the Police Department.

In the present instance, which has so exercised CORE, the criminal, shot down while fleeing after committing an outrageous robbery, turned out to have a record as long as your arm.

We suggest that rather than another investigation of the Police Department, the incident indicates there should be an investigation of the parole system which returns career predators, with jail terms still uncompleted, to the city's streets where they resume preying on defenseless citizens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

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

QUALIFICATIONS OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, twice before—in 1956 and 1957—I submitted resolutions which would have required that at least one of each two successive nominations confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court should have had at least 10 years of prior judicial service for confirmation. I am resubmitting the same resolution at this time, being all the more persuaded that the adoption of and adherence to such a resolution would be in the interest of a better judiciary at the highest level, and consequently the best interests of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, I may submit the resolution for myself and for the Senator from Virginia

[Mr. ROBERTSON], and that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least ten years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, of the Justices now sitting on the Court, three Associate Justices have been regularly appointed since, on February 18, 1957, I last submitted the resolution, and at that time another, Mr. Justice Brennan, was sitting under a recess appointment. The three Justices in question are Mr. Justice Stewart, who received an interim appointment on October 14, 1958, and a permanent appointment on May 7, 1959; Mr. Justice White, who was appointed on April 12, 1962; and Mr. Justice Goldberg, who was appointed on September 28, 1962. Five years is the total of prior judicial experience for Mr. Justice Stewart, Mr. Justice Goldberg, and Mr. Justice White; and all of it is concentrated in Mr. Justice Stewart, who sat on the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit from June 1, 1954 to May 15, 1959. Apart from Mr. Justice Black's service on a minor rung of the judicial ladder—police court in Birmingham, Ala., 1910-11—the total prior judicial experience of the nine justices now sitting is only 14 years, consisting of 8 years for Mr. Justice Brennan, 5 years for Mr. Justice Stewart, and 1 year for Mr. Justice Harlan. As I have stated, Mr. Justice Brennan was sitting on the Court when I last submitted the resolution, and after that was permanently appointed on March 21, 1957.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. The junior Senator from Wyoming joined with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] on a bill, S. 222, which states that "no person shall be appointed to the office of Chief Justice of the United States or to the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court unless, at the time of his appointment, he has had at least 5 years of judicial service."

The resolution of the Senator from Virginia would require that at least one of each two successive nominees have judicial experience. Does not the Senator feel that the Supreme Court would be materially strengthened if all the Justices had at least 5 or 10 years of judicial experience?

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly agree with the Senator from Wyoming and think it would strengthen the Court and would serve the very purpose the Senator from Mississippi here has in mind. The resolution of the Senator from Mississippi takes a different approach to the matter of trying to bring more prior judicial experience to the personnel of the Court.

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me say that the Senator from Wyoming agrees wholeheartedly with the approach of the Senator from Mississippi. I was just wondering about the reason for leaving out the requirement that one out of the two successive nominees have such experience.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his support and his inquiry. The question has been raised as to whether or not a statute requiring prior judicial practice would be valid under the Constitution. A serious constitutional question has been raised on that point. Also, if there were a requirement of judicial experience for all the nominees, a considerable part of the talent of the Nation in that profession would be excluded.

Now, as a start, as a beginning point, and also as a simple way of getting at the problem by a Senate resolution, the Senator from Mississippi has proposed that we just announce in advance, under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution, that in passing on these nominations at least one out of two will have to have had 10 years of judicial experience; otherwise, the nominations just will not be confirmed. It will not refer to any individual. The Senate, under its constitutional responsibility of advice and consent, will merely be announcing a rule in advance.

The Senator from Mississippi thinks that would be a salutary start toward a reform that is overdue and also be another assertion by the Senate, for the legislative branch of the Government, not only of its power but of its responsibility of looking into this matter in advance.

I thank the Senator very much for his fine support. I hope he pursues his bill further.

Resuming with my prepared remarks, I deem it necessary that some qualifications of judicial experience should be a requisite for at least one-half of the nominees for this post and because in recent years such experience has not been considered of prime importance by those persons who advise the President on his selection of nominees. In respect of what I consider to be the prime ingredient for service on the Supreme Court, namely, experience on the bench, I believe that this highest of tribunals has been sadly neglected in the past 30 years or so and that the Nation has greatly been the loser thereby. In our tripartite system of Government, with each branch complementing the other, distinctions perhaps should not be drawn as to the comparative importance of its various branches. Yet the Supreme Court authority is so vast and far reaching with its power to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional that it may be said in a sense that it is the most important segment of Government; in so many

cases, it is the final arbiter, the last word. Yet, it is this branch of Government which has a total of only 14 years' prior judicial experience, all of it distributed among only three Justices although all nine sit on cases of vital consequence to the 188 million people of this country.

Mr. President, this expression of opinion on my part constitutes no attack on any particular Justice.

I am bringing to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the country a serious defect in the functioning of our system of government.

It is interesting to compare the previous judicial experience of the present members of the Court, at the time of their appointment, with that of judges appointed through the years. Since John Jay was appointed as the first Chief Justice in 1790, there have been 98 judges appointed to the Court, including 14 Chief Justices.

From 1790 until 1900, 58 judges were appointed, and only 19 of them had no prior judicial experience. In the years from 1900 to 1932, 20 judges were appointed, with the majority—11 of them—with previous judicial experience. But in recent years, from 1932 until the present time, those appointed without prior judicial experience have outnumbered those with such experience 12 to 8. Unfortunately, we now have only 3 judges on the Court who possessed prior judicial experience at the time of their appointment. This is not a healthy trend.

At my request, the American Law Section of the Library of Congress has compiled a list of all the Chief Justices and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, including a reference to the prior judicial experience of those who possess such experience, and I think the Senate will be interested in this list. I request unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

CHIEF JUSTICES, SUPREME COURT SERVICE, AND PRIOR JUDICIAL SERVICE

John Jay, 1790-96, chief justice, New York, Supreme Court, 1776-79.

John Rutledge, 1795-95 (4 mos.), chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791-95.

Oliver Ellsworth, 1796-1800, judge, Governor's Council, Connecticut (Supreme Court of Errors), Colonial, 1780-85, judge, Supreme Court, Connecticut, 1785-89.

John Marshall, 1801-35, none found.

Roger Brooke Taney, 1836-64, none found. Salmon Portland Chase, 1864-73, none found.

Morrison Remick Waite, 1874-88, none found.

Melville Weston Fuller, 1888-1910, none found.

Edward Douglas White, 1910-21, justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879-80.

William Howard Taft, 1921-30, judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1887-93, judge, Federal Circuit Court, Sixth Circuit, 1892-1900.

Charles Evans Hughes, 1930-41, none found.

Harlan Fiske Stone, 1941-46, none found.

Frederick Moore Vinson, 1946-53, Associate Justice, U.S. Court of Appeals, 1938-43, D.C. Earl Warren, 1953 to present, none found.

ASSOCIATE COURT SERVICE, AND PRIOR JUDICIAL SERVICE

- John Rutledge, 1790-91, chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791-95.
- William Cushing, 1790-1810, probation judge, Lincoln County, Maine (Colonial) 1760-72, judge, Superior Court, Massachusetts (Colonial) 1772-75, judge, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1775-77, chief justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1777-89.
- James Wilson, 1789-98, none found.
- John Blair, 1789-96, general court, Virginia (Colonial) 1778-86; judge, high court of chancery, Va. (Colonial) 1780; judge, Virginia First Court of Appeals, 1780-1789.
- James Iredell, 1790-99, superior court judge, North Carolina (Colonial) 1777-78.
- Thomas Johnson, 1792-93, chief judge, general court, Maryland. (Colonial) 1790-91.
- William Paterson, 1793-1806, none found.
- Samuel Chase, 1796-1811, chief judge, criminal court, Baltimore, Md. (Colonial) 1788; chief judge, general court, Maryland, 1791.
- Bushrod Washington, 1799-1829, none found.
- Alfred Moore, 1800-04, judge, superior court, North Carolina, 1798-99.
- William Johnson, 1804-34, judge, court of common pleas, 1798-1804.
- Henry Brockholst Livingston, 1807-23, judge, Supreme Court of New York, 1802-06.
- Thomas Todd, 1807-26, judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1801-06; chief justice, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1806-07.
- Gabriel Duvall, 1811-35, none found.
- Joseph Story, 1811-45, none found.
- Smith Thompson, 1823-43, associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1802-14; chief justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1814-19.
- Robert Trimble, 1826-28, judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1807-09; Federal district judgeship, Kentucky, 1817-26.
- John McLean, 1830-61, judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1861-22.
- Henry Baldwin, 1830-44, none found.
- James Moore Wayne, 1835-67, judge, Superior Court, Georgia, 1824-29.
- Philip Pendleton Barbour, 1836-41, judge, general court, Virginia, 1825-27; judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern, Virginia, 1830-36.
- John Catron, 1837-65, judge, Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals (then court of last resort), Tennessee, 1824-31.
- John McKinley, 1837-52, none found.
- Peter Vivian Daniel, 1842-60, judge, U.S. district court, Virginia, 1836-41.
- Samuel Nelson, 1845-72, judge, 6th circuit, New York, 1823-31; associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1831-45.
- Levi Woodbury, 1845-51, judge, New Hampshire Superior Court, 1817-23 (6 years).
- Robert Cooper Grier, 1846-70, presiding judge, district court, Allegheny County, Pa., 1833-46.
- Benjamin Robbins Curtis, 1851-57, none found.
- John Archibald Campbell, 1853-61, none found.
- Nathan Clifford, 1858-81, none found.
- Noah Haynes Swayne, 1862-81, none found.
- Samuel Freeman Miller, 1862-90, justice of the peace, Barboursville, Ky., (date?).
- David Davis, 1862-77, judge, 8th judicial district, Illinois, 1848-62.
- Stephen Johnson Field, 1863-97, justice, Supreme Court, California, 1857-63.
- William Strong, 1870-80, judge, Supreme Court, Pennsylvania, 1857-68.
- Joseph P. Bradley, 1870-92, none found.
- Ward Hunt, 1873-82, New York Court of Appeals, 1865-73.
- John Marshall Harlan, 1877-1911, judge, county court, Franklin County, Ky., 1858-59.
- William Burnham Woods, 1880-87, judge, U.S. Circuit Court, Fifth Circuit, 1869-80.
- Stanley Matthews, 1881-89, judge, court of common pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio, 1851, judge, superior court, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1863-65.
- Horace Gray, 1881-1902, justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1864-81.
- Samuel Blatchford, 1882-93, district judge, New York, second district, 1867-73; circuit judge, second judicial district, 1873-82.
- Lucius Quintas C. Lamar, 1888-93, none found.
- David Josiah Brewer, 1889-1910, commissioner, Federal circuit court, district of Kansas, 1861-62; judge, probation and criminal courts, Leavenworth County, Kans., 1862-65; judge, first judicial district of Kansas, 1865-69; Supreme Court of Kansas, 1870-84; Federal circuit court, eighth district, 1884-89.
- Henry Billings Brown, 1891-1906, circuit judge, Wayne County, Mich., 1868- (?); U.S. judge, eastern district, Michigan, 1875-90.
- George Shiras, Jr., 1892-1903, none found.
- Howard Edmunds Jackson, 1893-95, circuit court, sixth circuit, 1886-91; presiding judge, circuit court, appeals, 6th circuit, 1891-93.
- Edward Douglas White, 1894-1910, justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879-80.
- Rufus Wheeler Peckham, 1896-1909, justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1883-86; Court of Appeals, New York, 1886-96.
- Joseph McKenna, 1898-1925, judge, Circuit Court, Ninth Circuit, 1892-97.
- Oliver Wendell Holmes, 1902-32, associate judge, superior judicial court, Massachusetts, 1883-1889; chief justice, superior judicial court, Massachusetts, 1889-1902.
- Rufus William Ray, 1903-22, judge, court of common pleas, 1886-89; U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1899-1903.
- William Henry Moody, 1906-10, none found.
- Horace Harmon Lurton, 1910-14, justice, Supreme Court, Tennessee, 1886-93; U.S. Circuit Court appeals judge, Sixth Circuit, 1893-1909.
- Charles Evans Hughes, 1910-16, none found.
- Willis Van Devanter, 1910-37, chief justice, Supreme Court, Wyoming, 1889-90; U.S. Circuit judge, Eighth Circuit, 1903-10.
- Joseph Rucker Lamar, 1911-16, associate justice, Supreme Court, Georgia, 1906-08.
- Mahlon Pitney, 1912-22, associate justice, New Jersey Supreme Court, 1901-08.
- James Clark McReynolds, 1914-41, none found.
- Louis Dembitz Brandeis, 1916-39, none found.
- John Hessin Clarke, 1916-22, U.S. District judge, North District of Ohio, 1914-16.
- George Sutherland, 1922-38, none found.
- Pierce Butler, 1923-39, none found.
- Edward Terry Sanford, 1923-30, judge, U.S. District Court, Middle and Eastern District, Tennessee, 1908-23.
- Harlan Fiske Stone, 1925-41, none found.
- Owen Josephus Roberts, 1930-45, none found.
- Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, 1932-38, judge, Supreme Court, New York, 1914; associate judge, Court of Appeals, New York, 1914-32.
- Hugo Lafayette Black, 1937 to present, police judge, Birmingham, Ala., 1910-11.
- Stanley Forman Reed, 1938-57, none found.
- Felix Frankfurter, 1939-62, none found.
- William Orville Douglas, 1939 to present, none found.
- Frank Murphy, 1940-49, judge, recorders court, Detroit, Mich., 1923-30.
- James Francis Byrnes, 1941-42, none found.
- Robert Houghwout Jackson, 1941-54, none found.
- Wiley Blount Rutledge, 1943-49, U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, 1939-43.
- Harold Hitz Burton, 1945-58, none found.
- Thomas Campbell Clark, 1949 to present, none found.
- Sherman Minton, 1949-56, Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, 1941-49.
- John Marshall Harlan, 1955 to present, U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, 1954-55.
- William J. Brennan, Jr., 1956 to present, superior court judge, New Jersey, 1949-50; appellate division judge, 1950-52; justice, Supreme Court, New Jersey, 1952-56.
- Charles E. Whittaker, 1957-62, U.S. District Court, Western District of Missouri, 1954-56; Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, 1956-57.
- Potter Stewart, 1959 to present, Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1954-58.
- Byron R. White, 1962 to present, none found.
- Arthur J. Goldberg, 1962 to present, none found.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am fully cognizant, of course, that there are a number of examples of fine and outstanding Justices of the Supreme Court who enjoyed no prior judicial experience. Among these were Chief Justice Marshall, Chief Justice Hughes, and Mr. Justice Brandeis, and there are others.

This resolution, of course, gives a President latitude for the appointment of such men so there can be no dispute on that aspect of the case, but there are powerfully persuasive reasons, policy reasons and others, which commend the principle that there is no substitute for judicial experience in the other high callings.

John Locke said in his Essay Concerning Human Understanding:

No man's knowledge here can go beyond his experience.

And Patrick Henry, speaking in the Virginia House of Delegates on March 23, 1775, said:

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience.

Mr. President, a seasoned Justice is not created overnight. Judicial maturity is attained only after long years of painstaking study, research and analysis. This experience should be gained under conditions where his aberrations and his deviations from the law will be brought forcefully home in reversals by higher courts. He will be ready for Olympus only after he has felt the bolts from the high places. He should not be placed in a position where his errors will be perpetuated on the books for years to come. A judicial approach is the result of years of development; it is the essence of self-restraint.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I warmly commend my distinguished colleague from Mississippi upon his able discussion of a most vital issue.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Mr. ROBERTSON. I heard him say, and I want to repeat it in order to emphasize it, that—

This experience—

Referring to previous experience as a judge—

should be gained under conditions where his aberrations and his deviations from the law will be brought forcefully home in reversals by higher courts.

Do we not often speak of a man having a judicial temperament?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A judicial temperament, as I construe it, is a temperament by which a judge, when he hears the evidence, will evaluate it calmly and dispassionately, and when he seeks to apply that evidence, he will apply it to the law as it is written, and not as it would be if he had written the law. Is that not judicial temperament?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a very excellent definition of it. It has been illustrated that such a temperament can be gained only by experience.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The Senator from Mississippi graduated in law from Thomas Jefferson's university, and made Phi Beta Kappa there. I graduated in law from what is now Richmond University, and made Phi Beta Kappa. But I think he will agree that neither he nor I were lawyers until we had had experience. We knew the theory of the law and the holdings in a few cases like Marbury against Madison, and the rule in Shelley's case, and things like that, but we had to get out under the spreading chestnut tree and before a justice of the peace, and then before a jury, before we were lawyers.

Mr. STENNIS. That is where real legal knowledge starts.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore, last year I was happy to join in the resolution of my colleague providing that one out of two successive nominees to the Supreme Court should have 10 years experience. There is only a total of 14 years prior judicial experience among the members of the Supreme Court at the present time.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have seen some appropriate statistics, speaking of the self-restraint that occurs out of respect for the law as it was written, and not as that person would have written it if he had had his free way.

Ever since President Roosevelt had Senator Ashurst introduce in this body in 1937 a bill to pack the Supreme Court on the ground that it was composed of what one might call reactionary fossils who could not interpret the Constitution in terms of 20th century conditions, the Supreme Court has overruled previous decisions of the Court 36 times, whereas previous to that time the Court in all the history of our Nation, from 1789 down to 1935, had made such over-rulings only 26 times.

Mr. STENNIS. Those are striking figures. I am glad the Senator brought them out, with that dividing line, because the Senator from Mississippi had a dividing line at 1932, which is another basis, but it was in 1937 when these over-rulings and reversals really started picking up, for the reasons that the Senator has given.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The reason the Senator from Virginia has paid so much attention to the dividing line of 1937 is that he has always contended that the general welfare clause was a limitation upon the powers specifically delegated; that these powers must be exercised, as Jefferson and Madison had held, for the general welfare, and that they cannot

hold out a sugar plum to some little town or some selected groups.

When President Roosevelt got on the neck of the Court about the NRA decisions, and about the decision that he could not put a processing tax on wheat and distribute it to the farmers because they were in violation of the 10th amendment, along comes the Supreme Court in Helvering against Davis, in 1937, and nullified the 10th amendment so far as any limitation on spending is concerned. They said in substance, "The general welfare clause gives us the power to spend for anything we please."

We used to go through the formality of putting a preamble on a bill, providing, "Whereas, the general welfare will be promoted," and so forth, and then the resolving clause. We do not bother with that any more. We just spend for anything we please. That is the reason the Senator from Virginia has paid so much attention to the fact that the Supreme Court as now constituted has no regard whatever for what those who wrote the Constitution said it meant, and has no regard for all of the great justices, from John Marshall on down, and for the 10th amendment, as being a part of the Constitution.

I warmly commend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The Senator from Virginia is one of the great constitutional lawyers of his generation and is an able and experienced Senator.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would not the Senator from Mississippi agree that the appointments to the Supreme Court over the past 30 years, at least, were based more on the principle of repayment of political obligations than upon any judicial experience of the appointees?

Mr. STENNIS. That has certainly been the case as to many of them, most unfortunately. It is partly the Senate's fault, I think, because it had not vigorously maintained its prerogatives and its clear responsibilities.

Mr. SIMPSON. I cannot agree with the Senator more.

Mr. STENNIS. Historically, until the last 30 years or so, the most effective check on the Supreme Court has been its own self-restraint. In the rumbles of dissenting justices since that time may be perceived their understanding within the court that the bounds of self-restraint have been violated time after time.

Mr. President, in that connection and on that subject, I quote from the Conference of the Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, at the convention held on August 23, 1958, at which convention they passed by a vote of 36 to 8 the following report, paragraph 5 of which I shall read, with emphasis:

5. That this conference hereby respectfully urges that the Supreme Court of the United States, in exercising the great powers confided to it for the determination of questions as to the allocation and extent of National and State powers, respectively, and as to the validity under the Federal Constitution of the exercise of powers reserved to the States, exercise one of the greatest of all

judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—by recognizing and giving effect to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable, to the end that our system of Federalism may continue to function with and through the preservation of local self-government.

That paragraph 5 is a notable landmark. It was adopted almost unanimously by the Conference of Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, at a critical time in our history. I believe that this resolution has done a great deal of good. However, alone it is not enough, persuasive as it is. What we need here, in this form, to pass on a very practical part of these selections, is a new start, a new approach, and a new formula, whereby these men are chosen.

I emphasize that I am not attacking any one of these Justices. I am not attacking the judicial branch of the Government, which I believe is the most important branch, and which can and will finally be restored.

Mr. President, may we have order? Conditions are almost intolerable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. STENNIS. A new start is necessary. What I propose is a constitutional way and a logical way to make that start. If we do not take some action in this direction, I believe it will come from some other source, and in the years to come could come in a violent form.

Located as it is at the very apex of Government with its vast power to strike down State and congressional laws and any and all parts of State constitutions requires that men selected to fill its numbers be the best qualified in the United States. Certainly the best qualification is experience in the same type of work, experience enabling the Justice to distill and refine the conflicting positions presented, experience that insulates against deep-set philosophy springing from representation of special groups, experience that provides the buffer between political affiliation and juridical determination.

What then are the constitutional provisions with respect to the Senate in respect to the process of appointment?

The Constitution provides in article II, section 2, that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law or in the heads of departments."

In the earliest days of our history, George Washington solicited advice on his appointments and considered recommendations at great length before

making his nominations to fill positions. With the growth of the two-party system in our country, however, the Senate's advice to the Executive in regard to nominations has been a totally neglected constitutional obligation. The function is now performed apparently by the Department of Justice or the Attorney General of the United States, himself an appointee of the President. It is indeed curious that this constitutional duty of the Senate should have, through neglect, crossed the line of the separation of powers and devolved to the Department of Justice—or the Attorney General—the chief litigant in our Federal courts. Add to this the power in the Attorney General to recommend appointment of sitting judges to higher courts and the enormity of our withdrawal from our duty becomes all the more apparent.

The phrase "advice and consent" is not a new or novel concept, nor was it original at the time it was written into the Constitution. While its origin may be obscure, former Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania, in his oral argument before the Supreme Court in *Myers v. U.S.* (272 U.S. 52, 1926) traced this important phrase back to 758 A.D. when he said:

The story, in English constitutional history, of the phrase "advice and consent" is coincident with the whole story of the rise and development of English parliamentary government. I find the phrase first used back in the eighth century, 759, when a Northumbrian king does such and such things with the "advice and consent" of his wise men. It comes down through Magna Carta. It comes down through all the ages. And when in 1787 it became necessary, as between those who were championing a strong executive and those who were championing the legislature, to find a middle ground, it was provided, in the language of old English law, that such-and-such things should be done by the President "with the advice and consent" of the Senate.

In America, I find that it was used in the second charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in 1691.

Records of the Constitutional Convention indicate that when the question of the appointive power was considered, an impressive group of delegates, including Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania, urged that the Senate should have this sole responsibility. Alexander Hamilton, the great Federalist, although insisting upon executive nominative power, suggested that the Senate should have the power of rejecting or approving a nomination made by the President.

It was, however, Delegate Gorham, of Massachusetts, who, after pointing out that this method had been in use in his Commonwealth for 140 years, was successful in having "advice and consent" inserted in our Constitution, as it remains today.

"Consent" may well have been the power which Hamilton sought to have conferred on the Senate. It implies and means a concurrence of will or agreement. Hearings preceding confirmation usually determine whether consent to the appointment will be given or withheld.

However, no action is normally taken by the Senate to advise the Executive prior to the nomination of a particular person to fill a vacancy in a constitutional office.

After a nominee has been selected and his name is sent to the Senate with the prestige and power of the President of the United States committed to him, and with the power of the party to which the President belongs usually committed to him, unless there is some flaw in the character of the nominee, his nomination, as a practical proposition, is not rejected. The question no longer is, does the nominee have the basic qualifications of a judicial mind? Or does he have the proper background of experience as a judge? Those questions have fallen by the wayside by the time the nomination has reached the floor of the Senate. The primary consideration then deals with other points.

We know that as a practical matter many times, unfortunately, promises seem to be made far in advance, based upon other contingencies; and the happening of intervening events then decides when the actual nomination shall be made.

A system has been developed which is far removed from the Constitution. A system has been adopted which is dangerous to follow. My resolution, simple as it is, would bring us back on the right track.

This I suggest can and should be done by action of the Senate, and I am today submitting a resolution to set forth and prescribe the minimum qualifications which the Senate would apply in confirming future appointments.

Mr. President, for emphasis, I point out that this device in no way interferes with the discretion of the President in making his selection but is, in essence, a restraint upon the future discretion of the Senate in its unique function of confirmation.

Other qualifications may occur to Senators and, while more restrictive criteria than mere professional experience may be the subject of debate on their merits, I feel that by the use of the Senate resolution our constitutional duty to provide a lawful and helpful guide to the President, regardless of who he may be, is one method of returning to the spirit and letter of our Constitution. My resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least ten years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in sec. 451 of title 28, U.S.C.), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

Mr. President, had this standard of selection obtained for the last 25 years, I doubt that we would have heard of paramount rights which produced, instantaneously, a new Constitution law doctrine in the submerged and tidal land cases; I doubt that we would have seen the finger of scorn pointed judicially at judicial precedent and contemporaneous legislative construction in order to open a new area of Federal power in locally maintained public schools throughout the country. I doubt whether many

other changes which have suddenly been made because the Court changed its mind would have occurred.

The results of the present selection of Judges are well known. A constitutional revolution has taken place in the last 30 years or so as is illustrated by the number of cases in which the Supreme Court had overruled prior decisions of the same Court. From 1789 until 1932, 27 such cases had been overruled. Since 1932, through 1962, 39 such cases have been overruled. These are all cases in which the Supreme Court expressly overruled its prior decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of those cases be printed in the RECORD.

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

(1) *Hudson v. Guestier* (1810) 6 Cr. 281, 285; (2) *The Genesee Chief* (1815) 12 How. 433, 456; (3) *Gazzam v. Phillip's Lessee* (1858) 20 How. 372, 377-378; (4) *Mason v. Eldred* (1868) 6 Wall. 231, 238; (5) *Hornbuckle v. Toombs* (1874) 18 Wall. 648, 652-653; (6) *Railway Co. v. McShane* (1874) 22 Wall. 444; (7) *County of Cass v. Johnston* (1877) 95 U.S. 360; (8) *Fairfield v. County of Gallatin* (1879) 100 U.S. 47; (9) *Tighman v. Proctor* (1880) 102 U.S. 707; (10) *U.S. v. Phelps* (1883) 107 U.S. 320, 323; (11) *Kountze v. Omaha Hotel Co.* (1883) 107 U.S. 378, 387; (12) *Morgan v. U.S.* (1885) 113 U.S. 476, 496; (13) *Leloup v. Port of Mobile* (1888) 127 U.S. 640, 647; (14) *Leisy v. Hardin* (1890) 135 U.S. 100, 118; (15) *Brenham v. German-American Bank* (1892) 144 U.S. 173, 187; (16) *Roberts v. Lewis* (1894) 153 U.S. 367, 377; (17) *Garland v. Washington* (1914) 232 U.S. 642, 646; (18) *U.S. v. Nice* (1916) 241 U.S. 591, 601; (19) *Rosen v. U.S.* (1918) 245 U.S. 467, 470; (20) *Boston Store v. American Graphophone Co.* (1918) 246 U.S. 8, 25; and *Motion Picture Co. v. Universal Plan Co.* (1917) 243 U.S. 502, 518; (21) *Terral v. Burke Construction Co.* (1922) 257 U.S. 529, 533; (22) *Lee v. Chesapeake and Ohio Ry. Co.* (1923) 260 U.S. 653, 659; (23) *Alpha Cement Co. v. Massachusetts* (1925) 268 U.S. 203, 218; (24) *Gleason v. Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co.* (1929) 278 U.S. 349, 357; (25) *Farmers Loan Co. v. Minnesota* (1930) 280 U.S. 204, 209; (26) *East Ohio Gas Co. v. Tax Commission* (1931) 283 U.S. 465, 472; (27) *Chicago and E.I.R. Co. v. Commission* (1932) 284 U.S. 296; (28) *New York ex rel. Northern Finance Corp. v. Lynch* (1933) 290 U.S. 601; (29) *Funk v. U.S.* (1933); (30) *West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish* (1937) 300 U.S. 379; (31) *Helvering v. Producers Corp.* (1938) 303 U.S. 376; (32) *Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins* (1938) 304 U.S. 64, 69, 79; (33) *Graves v. N.Y. ex rel. O'Keefe* (1939) 306 U.S. 466; (34) *O'Malley v. Woodrough* (1939) 307 U.S. 277; (35) *Madden v. Kentucky* (1940) 309 U.S. 83; (36) *Helvering v. Hallock* (1940) 309 U.S. 106; (37) *U.S. v. Darby* (1941) 312 U.S. 100; (38) *U.S. v. Chicago, M. St. P. and P.R. Co.* (1941) 312 U.S. 592; (39) *Nye v. U.S.* (1941) 313 U.S. 33; (40) *California v. Thompson* (1941) 313 U.S. 109; (41) *Olsen v. Nebraska* (1941) 313 U.S. 236; (42) *Alabama v. King and Boozer* (1941) 314 U.S. 1; (43) *State Tax Commission v. Aldrich* (1942) 316 U.S. 174; (44) *Williams v. North Carolina* (1942) 317 U.S. 287; (45) *Brady v. Roosevelt S.S. Co.* (1943) 317 U.S. 575; (46) *Jones v. Opelika* (1943) 319 U.S. 103 (reargument); (47) *Board of Education v. Barnette* (1943) 319 U.S. 624; (48) *Smith v. Allwright* (1944) 321 U.S. 649; (49) *Grouard v. U.S.* (1946) 328 U.S. 61; (50) *Angel v. Burlington* (1947) 330 U.S. 183; (51) *Lincoln Union v. Northwestern* (1949) 335 U.S. 525; (52) *Commissioner v. Church* (1949) 335 U.S. 632, 637; (53) *Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Texas Co.* (1949) 336 U.S. 342; (54) *Cosmo-*

politan Co. v. McAllister (1949) 337 U.S. 783; (55) *U.S. v. Rabinowitz* (1950) 339 U.S. 56, 66, 85; (56) *Joseph Burstyn Inc., v. Wilson* (1952) 343 U.S. 495, 502; (57) *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) 347 U.S. 483, 491, 494-495; (58) *Reid v. Covert* (1957) 354 U.S. 1; (59) *Vanderbilt v. Vanderbilt* (1957) 354 U.S. 416, 419; (60) *Ladner v. U.S.* (1958) 358 U.S. 169 (on rehearing); (61) *S.S. Monrosa v. Carbon Black, Inc.* (1959) 359 U.S. 180; (62) *U.S. v. Raines* (1960) 362 U.S. 17, 27; (63) *Elkins v. U.S.* (1960) 364 U.S. 206, 210, 212-213, 283; (64) *James v. U.S.* (1961) 366 U.S. 213, 215, 221, 223, 241; (65) *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961) 366 U.S.; (66) *Gladden Company v. Zdanok* (1962) 370 U.S. 530, 542, 585.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in addition, Congress has in the 30-year span between 1931 and 1961 enacted 27 specific pieces of legislation to nullify Supreme Court decisions to correct the mischief wrought by the decisions of the Court.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the decisions in questions and their nullifying acts.

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

1. *Milliken v. United States*, 283 U.S. 15 (1931) (gifts in contemplation of death; estate tax). Nullifying acts: 46 Stat. 1516 (1931); 74 C.R. 7078-7079; 7198-7199 (1931).
2. *Kessler v. Strecker*, 307 U.S. 22 (1939) (deportation of alien Communists). Nullifying acts: 54 Stat. 670, 673, sec. 22 (1940).
3. *U.S. v. Underwriters Assn.*, 322 U.S. 533 (1944) (Federal regulation of insurance companies). Nullifying acts: 59 Stat. 33 (1945); 15 U.S.C. 1011-1015.
4. *Brooklyn Bank v. O'Neil*, 324 U.S. 697 (1945). Nullifying act: 61 Stat. 84 (1947). *Schulte Co. v. Gangi*, 328 U.S. 108 (1946). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 84 (1947); 63 Stat. 910, 920 (1949).
- Anderson v. Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.*, 328 U.S. 680 (1946) (portal-to-portal pay under FLSA). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 84 (1947); 63 Stat. 910, 920 (1949).
5. *Packard Co. v. Labor Board*, 330 U.S. 485 (1947) (foreman and supervisory employees entitled as a class to bargain collectively under NLRA). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 136, 137, sec. 2 (1947); 29 U.S.C. 152(3).
6. *United States v. Silk*, 337 U.S. 704 (1947) ("employees" for purpose of social security employment tax). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 438 (1948); 26 U.S.C. 3121(d), 3306(i).
7. *Taucy v. N.Y. Life Ins. Co.*, 314 U.S. 118 (1941) (Federal courts forbidden to stay in personam proceeding in a State court embracing a cause already litigated in Federal tribunal). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 969, 968 (1948); 28 U.S.C. 2283. (See H. Rept. No. 308; 80th Cong., 1st sess., pp. A 181-182 (1947).)
8. *Dobson v. Commissioner*, 320 U.S. 489 (1943) (nonreviewability of certain Tax Court determinations). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 869, 991 sec. 36 (1948); 26 U.S.C. 7482(a).
9. *United States v. Wyoming*, 331 U.S. 440 (1947) (rejection of State's claim of title in certain school lands included in a Federal petroleum reserve). Nullifying act: 62 Stat. 1233 (1948).
10. *Bay Ridge Co. v. Aaron*, 334 U.S. 446 (1948) (payment of overtime on overtime under FLSA). Nullifying acts: 63 Stat. 446 (1949); 29 U.S.C. 207(d).
11. *Comm'r v. Estate of Church*, 335 U.S. 632 (1949); *Estate of Spiegel v. Comm'r*, 335 U.S. 701 (1949) (estate tax). Nullifying acts: 63 Stat. 891, 894, sec. 7 (1949); 26 U.S.C. 2035-2037.
12. *Martino v. Mich. Window Cleaning Co.*, 327 U.S. 172 (1946) (coverage under FLSA of local window-washing contractor whose cus-

tomers manufactured goods shipped in interstate); *Roland Co. v. Walling*, 326 U.S. 657 (1946) (covering under FLSA of local electrical contractor who serviced nearby industrial establishments); *Farmers Irrigation Co. v. McComb*, 337 U.S. 755 (1949) (covering under FLSA a farmers' irrigation cooperative). Nullifying acts: 63 Stat. 910, 911, 917 (1949); 29 U.S.C. 203j, 213(a) (2, 6).

13. *Commissioner v. Smith*, 324 U.S. 177 (1945) (compensation through exercise of stock option-taxability). Nullifying acts: 64 Stat. 906, 942, sec. 218 (1950); 26 U.S.C. 421.

14. *Commissioner v. Korrell*, 339 U.S. 619 (1950) (amortization of bond premium-taxability). Nullifying acts: 64 Stat. 906, 941, sec. 217 (1950); 26 U.S.C. 171(b) (1).

15. *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 339 U.S. 33 (1950) (application of Administrative Procedure Act to deportation of aliens). Nullifying act: 64 Stat. 1044, 1048 (1950).

16. *Commissioner v. Tower*, 327 U.S. 280 (1946); *Lusthaus v. Commissioner*, 327 U.S. 293 (1946); *Commissioner v. Culbertson*, 337 U.S. 733 (1949) (taxation of family partnerships). Nullifying acts: 65 Stat. 452, 511, sec. 340 (1951); 26 U.S.C. 704.

17. *Wilmette Park Dist. v. Campbell*, 338 U.S. 411 (1949) (amusement tax). Nullifying acts: 65 Stat. 453, 519, sec. 402 (1951); 26 U.S.C. 4233(a) (4).

18. *Bindczyck v. Finucane*, 342 U.S. 76 (1951) (Nationality Act precludes State courts from annulling their own naturalization). Nullifying act: 66 Stat. 163, 262, sec. 340(j).

19. *Cline v. Kaplan*, 323 U.S. 97 (1944) (party against whose property a trustee in bankruptcy had asserted a claim is competent to withdraw from summary jurisdiction of bankruptcy court at any time before judgment). Nullifying acts: 66 Stat. 420-421, sec. 2 (1952); 11 U.S.C. 11(a) (7) (see S. Rept. 1395; 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 3 (1952)).

20. *Schwegmann Bros. v. Calvert Corp.*, 341 U.S. 384 (1951) (inapplicability of Federal fair trade law to nonsigners of resale price maintenance contracts). Nullifying acts: 66 Stat. 631 (1952); 15 U.S.C. 45(a).

21. *United States v. California*, 332 U.S. 19 (1947); *United States v. Louisiana*, 339 U.S. 699 (1950); *United States v. Texas*, 339 U.S. 707 (1950) (Federal dominion over offshore oil (submerged lands)). Nullifying acts: 67 Stat. 29 (1953); 43 U.S.C. 1301-1314.

22. *United States v. Cardiff*, 344 U.S. 19 (1952) (Inspections under Pure Food Drug and Cosmetic Act). Nullifying acts: 67 Stat. 476 (1953); 21 U.S.C. 374.

23. *Power Comm'n v. East Ohio Gas Co.*, 338 U.S. 464 (1950) (regulation of distributors of natural gas selling exclusively to local consumers in one State). Nullifying acts: 68 Stat. 36 (1954); 15 U.S.C. 717(c).

24. *United States v. Wunderlich*, 342 U.S. 98 (1951) (nonreviewability of Government contracts having finality clauses). Nullifying acts: 68 Stat. 81 (1954); 41 U.S.C. 321-322.

25. *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Wisconsin*, 347 U.S. 672 (1954) (Federal regulations of rates of facilities used in production and gathering of natural gas). Nullifying acts: Natural gas bill of 1956 (vetoed) 102 C.R. 2897 (1956); H. Rept. No. 992 on H.R. 6645; 84th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1 (1955).

26. *Maritime Board v. Isbrandtsen Co.*, 356 U.S. 481 (1958) (dual shipping rate contracts unlawful). Nullifying acts: 72 Stat. 574 (1958); 75 Stat. 762 (1961); 46 U.S.C. 812, 813b.

27. *Guss v. Utah Labor Board*, 353 U.S. 1, 15 n. 7 (1957) etc. (no man's land; State courts and agencies precluded from asserting jurisdiction over labor disputes as to which NLRB had declined to cede or to assert jurisdiction). Nullifying acts: 73 Stat. 519, 541, sec. 701 (1959); 29 U.S.C. 164.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the foregoing compilations of cases I am indebted to the American Law Section of the Library of Congress.

Mr. President, what are we to conclude from the constitutional upheaval that has taken place? Are we to conclude that superior wisdom has inhered in the Justices of recent vintage, as compared with those sitting during the first 143 years or so of the Court? Granting that the Constitution is a living, breathing organ which allows for growth and has the vitality to be accommodated to the changing times is one thing; discarding the learning or pretty much of all the learning that has previously prevailed is another thing. I think it may fairly be stated that there is not contempt alone for all that has gone before but an excessive devotion to doctrines imported from extralegal domain that is responsible for this legal revolution. Certainly a proper reverence for the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of the centuries does not comport with what has been taking place on the Court.

When the proper domain of the law is invaded by social theories and hypotheses that have no legitimate claim to recognition, sound legal doctrine suffers thereby and the foundations of a hallowed judicial system begin to totter.

But if we honor the admirable method of the common law and restore it, we could be on our way back to restoring the legal system that has served us so well. This was the Anglo-Saxon legal system described by the judge in John Galsworthy's play, "Justice," as a "majestic edifice, sheltering all of us, each stone of which rests on another."

Let us not substitute sand for stone in our highest legal edifice. Rather, by this single proposal, let us supply the stone of judicial experience.

I emphasize again that this is no attack on the Court as such, nor is it an attempt to discredit any member of the Court. This is a plea for recognition of time-honored and time-tested values of judicial experience and judicial maturity in at least one-half of the nominees to the highest Court of the land.

Further, it is a plea that the U.S. Senate shall forthwith return to its constitutional duty and power of giving advice in the choice of the nominees before they are nominated. This can be done in advance without reference to any individual and without embarrassment to any President. The Senate in the exercise of its constitutional power should announce that at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall have at least 10 years' prior judicial experience. This would be a salutary start, and other steps could follow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DAIRY LEGISLATION HEARINGS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in the past 5 years the Congress has enacted laws modifying our programs on wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and also our cotton and rice programs. But somehow we have failed to modify the milk or dairy legislation which we now have on the statute books, notwithstanding the fact that the dairy program is one of the most costly programs we have.

Mr. President, beginning on next Monday morning, the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on proposed dairy legislation. It is my hope that at the conclusion of the hearings, the committee will be able to recommend legislation for improvements in our current dairy programs. I have invited representatives of the various dairy and milk producer organizations to give testimony. I am hopeful they will be able to make some constructive suggestions toward developing a means of adequately supporting the income of milk producers, without the recurrent accumulation of excessive quantities of dairy products by the Government, at a high cost, as has been the case under the present law.

The dairy price-support program has been one of the most costly programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. The realized losses by the Government on this program over the past 10 years have exceeded \$2.5 billion. Milk is an important commodity, and I realize that these expenditures have represented only about 5 percent of the income received by milk producers; but this is still a very costly program.

Two years ago, major dairy organizations were urging that the price-support level for milk be increased because producers incomes were too low. No one disputed the fact that dairy farm income was low; and in the Congress there was strong bipartisan support for increasing the support level above the \$3.22 per hundredweight level which prevailed at that time. The Secretary of Agriculture, in good faith, granted an increase to \$3.40 per hundredweight for the 1961-62 marketing year.

Without any means of keeping milk supplies in check, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of surplus dairy products began to rise. They rose both as a result of increasing milk production and an inopportune decline in milk consumption. Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of dairy products doubled, and Government expenditure for dairy price support increased from less than \$300 million to over \$600 million in a year's time. As a result, it was necessary to lower the support level again to the minimum support level permitted by the law; and, even so, it appears that we shall continue to spend in the neighborhood of \$500 million a year.

In the last few months, milk production has fallen off slightly from the levels of a year ago; but at this early date we cannot be assured that it is the beginning of any sustained downward trend in production.

With slightly lower beef prices in prospect for the coming year, it is unlikely that there will be any great reduction in cow numbers; and with just an average increase in productivity, milk production will set a new record in the coming year, leaving little possibility that the surplus problem will disappear.

One of the biggest problems in developing new dairy legislation is that we really have separate programs, one for fluid milk and one for manufacturing milk. Neither of these programs is adequate to keep us from getting into surplus problems.

While we usually speak of the dairy problem in terms of the surpluses of

manufactured dairy products acquired under the dairy price-support program, the milk-marketing-order program, which started 30 years ago, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, certainly has been a contributing factor. This program was established in the early 1930's to deal with the serious problems of pricing fluid milk around metropolitan markets.

It is impossible for a fluid milk market to operate without having some amount of milk in excess of what is needed for bottling purposes. Both milk production and milk demand change seasonally, and even from day to day. Because of this, it is necessary to have a reserve of at least 10 to 15 percent, to assure that the market will have an adequate supply of milk for fluid use. When the reserve is not needed, it is diverted to other uses. Before the days of Federal orders, farmers found that the presence of this reserve supply tended to result in lower and lower prices for their fluid milk, because there was no orderly way of keeping the reserve supply separated from the milk used in the higher valued uses. Thus, the price for all milk would tend to drop toward the surplus price. This was an intolerable situation, because milk for fluid use must be of the very highest quality, produced on farms where an exceptional degree of sanitation is maintained, and requiring high capital investments in the best of milk handling and cooling equipment.

To remedy their problems, farmers first resorted to collective bargaining through cooperative associations, attempting to price the milk used for fluid purposes separately from the reserve supplies. But these collective-bargaining arrangements were only partially effective, because a minority of the producers or handlers could disrupt the agreement by taking advantage of those who were bearing the responsibility for handling the reserve supplies. These arrangements broke down almost completely in the early years of the depression of the 1930's.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 authorized licenses and agreements to regulate the handling of milk. This early authority was designed primarily to permit enforcement of the arrangements which had previously been developed by the cooperative. Later, however, this authority was spelled out in greater detail by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, under which our present Federal milk marketing orders are operated.

The main point I want to make is that these Federal orders were established to provide for the orderly marketing of fluid milk, geared to the markets needs. They were not designed to encourage the production of surplus milk. The important thing they were to accomplish was to permit the carrying of the small quantity of reserve supply which is so necessary to the efficient operation of a market, without allowing this reserve supply to set the price for the whole market.

The marketing orders accomplish this by providing, for fluid milk, a minimum price, commensurate with the higher cost

of producing milk, which will meet fluid milk quality requirements. They set a separate minimum price for the reserve supplies consistent with the manufacturing uses to which they are put. It was never intended that these pricing arrangements should be used to encourage the marketing of ever-increasing amounts of surplus milk.

As the early program has grown, so has the amount of surplus associated with these markets. Since 1940 the number of markets covered by Federal orders has increased from 17 to 83. The amount of milk regulated under these orders has increased from less than 20 percent to almost 50 percent of all the milk marketed in the United States. Over the same period, the percentage of Federal order milk used for manufacturing purposes has increased from less than 30 percent to almost 40 percent. In some of the larger markets the amount of milk used for manufacturing purposes exceeds the milk used for fluid purposes. For example, in the Chicago market only 39 percent, and in the New York-New Jersey market 49 percent was used in class I in 1962, that is, for direct consumption.

If the milk supplies in the Federal order markets had been held to the original objective of supplying the fluid needs of the markets plus a reasonable reserve, the large dairy surplus would not be as great as it is today. Excess milk in three of our largest milk-marketing orders alone is greater than the amount of milk represented by the surplus products purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation this past year. Of course, I do not mean to imply that these three markets alone are responsible for the large Government purchases, but surely they did contribute much.

One of the bills which will be considered at the hearings next week is a bill I introduced last August and again this session. This bill requires that each Federal milk-marketing order contain provisions under which the Secretary would determine the amount of milk necessary to meet the fluid requirements for the market, including necessary reserves. When a market's supply of milk is in excess of this necessary quantity, each producer will receive an allotment representing his share of the market's necessary fluid and reserve requirements. I want to emphasize that my bill does not in any way change the existing procedures for setting the minimum prices paid for fluid milk and the necessary market reserves. In other words, the intent of my bill is to assure farmers a good price for the milk produced to meet the needs of the market. I repeat, the farmer would get a good price for the milk produced within his allotment. However, the payment he receives for any milk which he markets in excess of his allotment shall be fixed at a level sufficiently below the manufacturing price to discourage his production and marketing of this excess. This might be 50 cents, a dollar, or \$2 lower than the manufacturing price, depending on the market. In any event, it must be low enough to discourage the production of surplus milk.

I should like to make it clear that my bill in no way affects the minimum class price paid by the handler, but only affects the manner in which the producer shares in the total amount paid by the handlers. The handler would continue to pay whatever the minimum class price might be, but the producer would receive only the discouraging price for the milk produced in excess of his allotment. The balance of the handler's payment for that milk would go into the pool to enhance the amount paid the producers for their allotment milk. For instance, let us assume that the minimum price for milk used for fluid purposes is now \$6 per hundredweight and the minimum price for milk used for manufacturing purposes is \$3 per hundredweight, and that about half of the milk is used for each purpose. The producer in such case now receives a blend price of about \$4.50 per hundredweight; that is, the average paid by handlers. Under the present law, as the proportion of milk going into manufacturing use increases, this blend price becomes lower and lower. The price goes down whether the farmer tries to keep production within reasonable limits or not.

Under my bill the handler would continue to pay \$6 for milk for fluid consumption and \$3 for milk for manufacturing use. But the producer would receive a price below \$3—for example, \$2—for his excess milk. For his allotment milk, he would receive in this example a blend consisting of the average of first, the market's requirements for fluid use multiplied by \$6; second, the market's reserve requirement multiplied by \$3, and third, the amount of excess milk delivered to the market multiplied by \$1—the difference between the amount paid to the producer for excess milk and the amount paid into the pool by the handler. This would take the producer off the treadmill he is now on, where he must continue to increase his production above market requirements in order to maintain his gross income at the same level. As each producer reduced his production toward his allotment, his return per hundredweight would increase. If any producer wanted to increase production without regard to market demand, he would hurt only himself. He would not lower his neighbor's price. In fact, his excess production would tend to increase the price of the producer who was trying to maintain production at a fair level. By giving farmers an incentive to reduce production, the bill would help to bring supplies down to the market requirements.

Apparently these provisions sound severe to some. However, the objective of my bill is exactly what the objective of the act has always been, that is, to provide a good price for milk needed to meet fluid requirements, including the reserves necessary thereto. I believe that producers in Federal-order markets would be better off under this type of program than they are at present. Today they are producing substantial quantities of surplus in excess of what can be justified for operation of the milk markets. These surpluses dilute their re-

turns from the class I market and drag the average price down. I believe a base plan of the type I suggested would be effective in reducing these surpluses, and as it did so, it would reward those dairy farmers who had reduced their production. There is no logic whatsoever in encouraging the production of \$3 milk in an area where producers need \$5 to \$6 to cover the cost of producing milk.

I can see how this approach may appear severe to producers in those markets where surpluses have grown far beyond the level that can be justified as a necessary operating service. Some consideration may have to be given to permitting these markets to adjust at a reasonable rate over a period of time. I hope that this will be fully explored at the hearings and that constructive suggestions for meeting this problem will be forthcoming. I am convinced that we can no longer tolerate the carrying of excessive surpluses in these markets if this program is to survive and do the job for dairy farmers which it was intended to do.

Dairying is the only major segment of American agriculture which has had the benefit of continued price support and market stabilization and yet has not faced the responsibility of keeping its production system in check. It would appear to me that producers and their representatives should assume this responsibility in light of the adverse criticism the program is now receiving. Over the past 2 years I have heard repeated reports of milk markets where the surplus was so great that good wholesome milk had to be dumped. The milk marketing orders are a wonderful instrument through which producers can develop a marketing system tailored to each individual market's unique problems. It would be unfortunate if this system collapsed because producers failed to recognize the need for making changes in their program as problems such as these arise. They have an opportunity at this point to support legislation which would correct these problems and put this system back in good working order.

My bill also provides for discretionary price support for manufacturing milk and butterfat at zero to 90 percent of parity.

Price support for milk, as we know it today, originated with the Agricultural Act of 1949. Before that, from 1938

through 1941, loans had been made to the Dairy Products Marketing Association to buy butter at prices specified by Commodity Credit Corporation. Prices were not to exceed 75 percent of the current parity price. With the advent of wartime shortages of fats and oils, a price support announcement was made on April 3, 1941. This was done to encourage increased production. Subsequent similar announcements were made under the so-called Steagall amendment which expired December 31, 1948. The Agricultural Act of 1948 provided price support for the next year, following which the Agricultural Act of 1949 became effective.

The support level under the Agricultural Act of 1949 is directed to assuring an adequate supply and has been made available through purchase of products. Dairy supports have never been intended to encourage excess production, nor to change in any way the objective of milk pricing under fluid milk marketing orders.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act was placed on the statute books in 1937. In effect, this law reenacted the marketing order provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 with certain important amendments. This act forms the basis for the many milk marketing orders now in effect.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 providing for price supports for manufacturing milk and butterfat was enacted in 1949. Since that enactment there have been no major revisions of either law as regards milk.

It is not that the Congress has not been aware of the many shortcomings which have become increasingly evident in these laws as time has passed.

Under these laws, and including the school milk program, the Government has spent a total of \$3.5 billion since 1953. About \$3 billion was spent directly in supporting the price of milk, while about \$500 million was spent for the school milk program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point table 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

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

TABLE 1.—Annual net expenditures for dairy programs, fiscal years 1954-62
(In millions)

| Fiscal year | CCC net expenditures ¹ | Military and veterans' milk program ² | Sec. 32 expenditures ³ | Total (excluding special milk) | Special school milk | Grand total |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 1953-54 | \$400.6 | | \$74.0 | \$474.6 | | \$474.6 |
| 1954-55 | 221.0 | \$1.0 | 24.4 | 246.4 | \$17.2 | 263.6 |
| 1955-56 | 218.0 | 7.3 | 39.0 | 264.3 | 45.8 | 310.1 |
| 1956-57 | 206.0 | 16.4 | 75.6 | 298.0 | 60.4 | 358.4 |
| 1957-58 | 195.4 | 30.4 | 123.7 | 349.5 | 66.3 | 415.8 |
| 1958-59 | 99.3 | 23.0 | 106.2 | 228.5 | 74.2 | 302.7 |
| 1959-60 | 149.9 | 23.6 | 35.1 | 208.6 | 80.5 | 289.1 |
| 1960-61 | 170.4 | 25.3 | 82.1 | 277.8 | 84.3 | 362.1 |
| 1961-62 | 529.9 | 25.9 | 47.1 | 602.9 | 88.5 | 691.4 |
| Total | 2,190.5 | 152.9 | 667.2 | 2,950.6 | 517.2 | 3,467.8 |

¹ CCC purchase and other costs (processing, repackaging, transportation, storage, and handling), less proceeds from sales (including sales to sec. 32).

² CCC reimbursements to military agencies, Veterans' Administration, and other participants.

³ Sec. 32 expenditures for purchases from CCC and direct purchases in the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Government has been required to purchase a total of 2.6 billion pounds of butter, 1.7 billion pounds of American cheese, and about 9 billion pounds of dry milk which was produced in excess of market needs. And, notwithstanding the tremendous efforts to dispose of this surplus, as of December 31, 1962, the Department of Agriculture still had about 294 million pounds of butter, 63 million pounds of cheese, and about one-half billion pounds of dry milk.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point table 2.

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

TABLE 2.—Dairy products: U.S. Department of Agriculture price support purchases, foreign and domestic utilization, and uncommitted stocks, cumulative 1949-62
[In million pounds]

| CCC activity | Butter | American cheese | Nonfat dry milk |
|--|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| CCC purchases, net..... | 2,622.6 | 1,743.8 | 8,970.0 |
| CCC utilization: | | | |
| Domestic..... | 1,665.7 | 905.7 | 1,956.6 |
| Foreign sales..... | 152.9 | 134.4 | 2,014.3 |
| Transfers and donations..... | 509.7 | 640.5 | 4,485.1 |
| Total, foreign..... | 662.6 | 774.9 | 6,499.4 |
| Total, utilization..... | 2,328.3 | 1,680.6 | 8,456.0 |
| CCC uncommitted stocks, Dec. 31, 1962..... | 294.3 | 63.2 | 514.0 |

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year alone the Government spent \$602.9 million supporting the price of milk, plus \$88.5 million for the school milk program.

As I see it, the Congress must come to grips with this problem. It cannot any longer be ignored because the industry representatives cannot agree on a new program.

In the past, when laws relating to other commodities have developed weaknesses, Congress has seen fit to act. And yet in the case of milk, which is the most costly program of all, there has been no action. This is intolerable. There must be a change. For if there is not, the taxpayers of this country may well demand that the entire program be sacked.

Now, the bill which I have introduced provides a basic framework for the development of a sound, healthy, and prosperous dairy industry, and certainly one that will be less costly to the Government.

I want it clearly understood, and I want to emphasize, that this legislation is not designed to lower the income of dairy farmers. Rather, it is designed to correct the inequities and shortcomings of the present law.

For example, it will in no way—and I repeat—positively in no way will it lower the price received by farmers for the very wholesome milk produced for use in fluid form by the consumers of this country. This milk is produced under the highest and strictest of sanitary requirements at a very high cost to farm-

ers. Producers must receive a good price for this milk. And under my bill they will.

My bill will not in any way curtail the production of milk which is required for fulfilling the needs of the fluid markets. As a matter of fact, it will encourage farmers to gauge their production to fully meet market needs. My aim is only to discourage the production of unneeded milk—milk that is produced in excess of market needs. This excess milk is giving both the farmers and the Government problems. This is the milk that is costing the Government money.

My bill is not designed to penalize those farmers who produce for the manufacturing markets. In my estimation, proper corrections in the market order areas will minimize the problems in the manufacturing milk areas. In addition, proper correction now of deficiencies in the price support program will preserve that program for the manufacturing milk producer. As a result, both parts of the milk industry will benefit and enjoy a prosperous future.

OUR CASTRO FIXATION VERSUS THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, last Friday the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], one of the wisest and most thoughtful Members of the Senate, warned against irresponsible discussion of American foreign policy and especially the Cuban question. The Senator from Montana expressed the view that "much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba," said the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], "but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and perversion of fact."

Recognizing that the late Republican Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, offered the Nation a classic example of constructive bipartisanship during the critical years after World War II, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] quoted Senator Vandenberg's warning to the Senate:

Only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by some sort of premature and ill-advised expressions of its advice to the Executive.

As a freshman Senator, Mr. President, I have been reluctant to add my voice to the current clamor over Cuba and Castro. I wholeheartedly endorse the majority leader's warning that on this and other foreign policy issues, no Senator should speak his mind until he has thought through the consequences of his words.

But keeping in mind the counsel of Senator Vandenberg and the majority leader, I am constrained to speak out against what seems to me to be a dangerous fixation on Castro that is not worthy of this great Nation. I submit

that we have become so involved in charges and countercharges about our Cuban policy that we have come close to losing sight of the real interests of the Nation in the hemisphere. We have ignored the biblical warning against straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

I have often wondered why the wily Khrushchev would invest so heavily in both capital and personnel in the kind of risky enterprise which Fidel Castro is frantically trying to establish in Cuba. If his purpose was to enhance the influence of Castro and Castroism in the hemisphere, he must be bitterly disappointed with the results, for the Castro-Khrushchev embrace has had the opposite effect. By turning his revolution over to Moscow, Castro has sacrificed much of his appeal to revolutionary leaders and followers in other Latin American States. No thoughtful observer of Latin American affairs has failed to note the decline of Castro's influence in the hemisphere since his marriage to the Kremlin.

But if Mr. Khrushchev's purpose was to create in Castro a gadfly designed to divert the attention of the United States from the real dangers and challenges of Latin America, then he must indeed feel that his investment has paid off handsomely. For each day brings some mighty blast at Castro from a highly placed American politician or commentator.

Meanwhile, the basic dangers to our security in the hemisphere—the economic, political, and social ills of Latin America—continue to fester. The United States has atomic bombs in its security arsenal, but on the side of insecurity we have a smoldering blockbuster on our doorstep to the south which makes Mr. Castro appear like a mouse trying to bring down an elephant.

I refer to the 200 million people of Latin America who occupy a vast land, potentially rich and fruitful but actually beset by misery, sickness, injustice, illiteracy, malnutrition, and misrule. It is a continent cursed by a social system that concentrates enormous wealth in the hands of the few and consigns the many to lives of desperate poverty. But make no mistake about it, powerful social forces are stirring to the south of us. Latin America is in a state of ferment; it is, as one observer put it, "dynamite on our doorstep."

Neither Fidel Castro nor Nikita Khrushchev nor international communism is at the base of this explosive situation. They are the exploiters and the would-be beneficiaries of the tensions and illness which threaten the security of the hemisphere, but they are not the fundamental factors. They are effects rather than causes.

Castro climbed to power over the carcass of a decadent political and social system which he shrewdly exploited, but which he did not create. The appeal of Castroism and communism in other parts of the hemisphere springs from the same corruption and social injustice which paved the way for the collapse of Batista and the triumph of Castro.

The real bombshells of Latin America are fused to the following conditions:

First, 2 percent of the people of the continent own more than half of all its wealth and land while most of the remainder of the people live in hopeless poverty.

Second, 80 percent of the people dwell in miserable shacks or huts.

Third, illiteracy grips well over half the population.

Fourth, more than 50 percent of the people suffer from hunger and disease and most of them will never in their lifetimes see a doctor, nurse, dentist, or pharmacist.

Fifth, most of the peasants live under primitive feudal conditions with no hope for land ownership, reasonable credit, or escape to a better life.

Sixth, several key countries depend on one-crop economies afflicted by depressed commodity prices.

Seventh, most governments are weakened by unjust tax structures, excessive military budgets designed to keep the people under control, bad land ownership and utilization, and indifference to shocking social problems.

Eighth, a population growth rate several times faster than the production of goods and services exists in several Latin American countries.

Two years ago, at the request of the President, I led a food-for-peace mission to Latin America which took us to northeast Brazil. In this benighted section of the largest and most populous nation of Latin America our mission came face to face with the real challenge to the hemisphere. There we saw the wretched life of Brazil's 27 million peasants who are trying to survive in the feudal, drought-stricken sections of the northeast. There we saw the miserable mud huts, the total absence of sanitation facilities, the villages devoid of doctors, teachers, and adequate water and food.

We saw, too, Fidel Castro's counterpart and alter-ego, Francisco Juliao, the flaming peasant leader, urging his wretched followers to seize the land and destroy the suppressors.

I ask the Senate to consider the real problems that confront us in this area. Is it Juliao or Castro? Or is it the unstable, frightful conditions on which they thrive?

It may very well be that in the long view of history, the Castros and the Juliaos for all their mischief and violence, will have indirectly performed some service in that they have forced us to give closer attention to our neighbors to the south. Likewise, they have confronted the ruling classes of Latin America with a stern choice between making long overdue reforms or seeing themselves swept aside in a series of violent Castro-type revolutions. Sometimes the hand of providence moves in strange ways. There can be no mistaking the fact that much of Castro's appeal to the oppressed rests on the knowledge that his presence has forced every government in the hemisphere to take a new and more searching look at the crying needs of the great masses of human beings.

The real issue, it seems to me, turns upon the question of whether or not the people can overturn an unjust social order through a peaceful democratic revolution, or whether they will do it by a violent Communist-led upheaval.

The Alliance for Progress is a mutual effort to raise standards of living through the painstaking, often frustrating, method of democratic reform and constructive economic development.

The Communists call for a quick upheaval that promises a new day through Marxist shortcuts Castro-style.

The Alliance for Progress will test the patience and toughness of all of us who believe in its promise. It does not appeal to the politician who wants a quick headline and a fast answer.

It is far easier to make loud speeches against an irritable, bearded dictator than to face the tough and sometimes painful tasks of making the Alliance for Progress work.

I suggest that we have had too many who are willing to shed the blood of our soldiers in an invasion of Cuba, and not enough courageous and thoughtful men giving their attention to the real problems confronting the Alianza.

We have too many self-styled experts telling the President the inside dope from their private intelligence sources and not enough expert analysis of depressed commodity prices, rural credit problems, land reform, and population pressures.

We have had too many postmortems over the ill-conceived Bay of Pigs invasion, which might have damaged our standing in the hemisphere more if it had succeeded through American military intervention, than it did as a miserable flop. We had no more legal right to undertake air cover or any other military aggression against Cuba than the Russians would have in invading Turkey. We have offensive nuclear weapons, not 90 miles from Russian territory, but in Turkey on the Soviet border, capable of pulverizing Russian cities in a matter of minutes.

The Cuban invasion, originally conceived in the previous administration, was a tragic mistake both in conception and execution for which President Kennedy has bravely taken the blame. Why compound the error by probing the ruins of a mistaken venture and then calling for a repeat performance?

I applaud President Kennedy's policy of wisdom and restraint since the Bay of Pigs fiasco. He has been firm and courageous in resisting the clamor of the warhawks.

Last October he rejected the counsels of those who called for a naval blockade before we knew the nature of the Russian arms shipments. The President also rejected the strong advice of those who favored an immediate air strike against Cuba. By waiting until he had positive proof of the Soviet-Cuban offensive missile threat before invoking a naval sanction, the President won unanimous support for his action from our Western allies and the countries of Latin America. He forced Khrushchev to back down, but he did it without war. He has since resisted those who have shouted for blood and battle and blockades.

Perhaps this is why for the first time the American people have indicated in a current Gallup poll that they have greater confidence in the capacity of the Democratic administration to preserve peace than they do in the opposition spokesmen. In another recent Gallup poll the American public registered its overwhelming opposition to an invasion of Cuba. The people understand better than some political figures that such an effort misses the real nature of the challenge before us.

The President put it this way:

I think the big dangers to Latin America— are the very difficult, and in some cases, desperate conditions in the countries themselves—unrelated to Cuba.

He has cited political and economic injustice, poor housing, illiteracy, and inadequate commodity prices as the big dangers to the security and well-being of the hemisphere.

As the President has said these are problems which must be faced and solved in the main by the people of Latin America. But he has also proclaimed our willingness to help.

Hence, the hopeful and inspiring promise of the Alliance for Progress.

Hence, the Peace Corps units which through the dedication and idealism of American youth are bringing new hope and pride to the villages of Latin America.

Hence, an expanded food-for-peace program which among other accomplishments is now providing a nutritious meal daily to 8½ million Latin American schoolchildren and to 5½ million babies and pregnant mothers.

Hence, the U.S. medical teams that are developing in Central America.

Hence, the growing exchange of students and teachers between the universities of North and South America.

These are the tools of hope and life and strength with which America is fighting the truly significant battles of the hemisphere. This is our best answer to communism and Castroism.

It is not yet clear that the ruling groups of Latin America are aroused sufficiently to their responsibilities to make the Alliance succeed on a broad scale. Nor is it clear that we have grasped fully the nature and scope of the leadership demands that are upon us as a great and powerful nation.

I earnestly hope that we will not dissipate our energies in a senseless fixation on Castro. Our mission is to point the way to a better life for the hemisphere and, indeed, for all mankind.

I conclude on this additional note, Mr. President: we dare not let our preoccupation with Mr. Castro and other irritants abroad blind us to our domestic responsibilities. If America is to fulfill its promise both at home and around the globe, we must move ahead on vital domestic fronts. We have a gigantic agricultural plant to be nurtured and stabilized; we are faced with the necessity of creating new job, educational and recreational opportunities for our young people; and older citizens are confronted by rising medical and hospital costs; we need to consider seriously the

relationship of our tax and fiscal policies to a sluggish national economy—these and many other mounting challenges call for clear minds and steadfast spirits.

It is no longer possible to separate America's domestic health from our position in world affairs.

Let us then move forward with a courage and prudence commensurate with our traditions and our responsibility as a great nation.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on what I believe is his maiden speech. Is it not?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It seems to me that the Senator from South Dakota has briefly, tersely, and very ably indeed allied himself with the Presidential party in the Senate. I am sure this will be a source of substantial comfort to the White House. I particularly like to commend my friend from South Dakota for his very able analysis of our Cuban policy, which I support as strongly as he does, for his able defense and his statement of hope for the future, for the Alliance for Progress, which I also support, as he does, and for his short and penetrating analysis, at the conclusion of his speech, of the major domestic issues which confront our country.

In the 7 years that I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate I do not believe that I have ever had the pleasure of listening to such an able maiden speech as that delivered by my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very kind and generous remarks.

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said:

Mr. President, in relation to my remarks made a few minutes ago about the Alliance for Progress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles written by Roscoe Drummond which were published recently in the Washington Post. One article relates to the general attitude of the American people toward foreign assistance; the other details some of the advances made by the Alliance for Progress.

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

LACK OF POPULAR SUPPORT IS A MYTH

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentionally made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview, the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden, one-twentieth of the budget, and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence:

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about \$4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive backup statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955.

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

LATIN REDS ARE DISHEARTENED

Latin American Communists are becoming downright disillusioned—and disheartened—by the Alliance for Progress. It isn't falling adequately. For them it is succeeding too well.

While some of its supporters in the United States, who expected it to perform miracles overnight, are disappointed that the Alliance

hasn't gotten off the ground faster, its Communist opponents are finding to their dismay that it has gotten off the ground too well for their comfort.

I am not suggesting that the first year's work of the 10-year Alliance for Progress has alone thrown the Communists on the defensive. It has helped, visibly helped. The Communists are most on the defensive where the Alliance has been most active. Here is some of the evidence:

In most of the Latin-American countries, notably in Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, the Communists are abandoning nearly all effort at peaceful persuasion and turning to violence and subversion as the only means of attaining their ends. They can't win converts from people who see even modest progress in the present, hope in the future.

The Latin American Communists are continuing to lose their influence in the labor movement where they thought their prospects were best. Today the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in South America embraces 8 million workers; the Red-dominated labor organization, not over one million.

Through Alliance aid 37 U.S. universities are now working with 57 Latin institutions in 18 countries to improve education. There is already evidence of a trend away from longtime Communist control of the universities in Central America.

All the ravages of a long-outdated economic system cannot be repaired in 12 months or 12 years, but the evidence is now sufficient to report that the Alliance is making a sturdy and steady beginning—and can succeed.

Here are some of the things that are right with the Alliance for Progress and show that, after an understandably slow beginning, more can be expected:

Fourteen Latin-American countries have either passed new and tighter tax legislation or improved their tax collections; in seven of these countries the reforms are on a major scale.

The Alliance is pursuing a rational and constructive course on agrarian reform. It is not promoting a casual, ineffective program of just cutting up large estates. It is promoting a modernizing of agriculture. Venezuela has succeeded in resettling nearly 60,000 farm families. Since last spring hundreds of families in the Dominican Republic have been resettled. In Chile, Colombia, Bolivia and elsewhere, similar programs are getting under way.

The Alliance is enlisting new financing for Latin America from Western Europe and from Japan and is carrying forward a positive campaign to attract more and essential investments by U.S. private business with guarantees against the risk of expropriation, inconvertibility and war.

I am not relying merely on Government figures to justify the report that the Alliance for Progress is beginning to make itself felt, is starting to pay dividends. The latest report on "Latin-American Business" from the Chase Manhattan Bank cites economic progress in Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela as improving and encouraging. No wishful thinking from that source.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Latin American Communists would breathe a sign of relief if we would give it up.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which is presently being considered by the legislatures of the re-

spective States of the Union. The two new States are Washington and Vermont, bringing to 22 the total number of States which have ratified the amendment.

I was informed late yesterday by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that the House of the Washington Legislature on February 26, 1963, approved the amendment unanimously by a vote of 95 to 0, and that the Senate on yesterday, March 14, also approved the amendment unanimously by a vote of 44 to 0. I salute both of my friends from Washington, Senators MAGNUSON and his distinguished colleague, Senator JACKSON, each of whom not only cosponsored my resolution in the 87th Congress which proposed submission of the amendment to the States but vigorously supported its approval by the Senate and then followed through aggressively to obtain its ratification by the legislature of their State.

Mr. President, it is most interesting to note for the record that when Senator MAGNUSON was a Member of the House of Representatives in the State of Washington in 1933, just 30 years ago, he introduced and vigorously supported a memorial in the Washington Legislature aimed at removing the poll tax as a requirement for voting, in an effort to start a movement whereby those States which had the poll tax requirement would eliminate it.

I believe that at the time there were 11 States in which a poll tax or other tax was a requirement for voting in Federal elections. I warmly congratulate Senator MAGNUSON for his long-time interest and effective leadership in this field.

The House of the Vermont Legislature only this morning ratified the amendment on final reading of the enabling resolution which it passed yesterday by a vote of 157 to 63, the Vermont Senate having previously ratified the amendment on February 6 by a unanimous voice vote.

I am greatly indebted to my good friend, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for this encouraging information and to both Senator AIKEN and his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], each of whom have shown their dedicated interest in this movement toward eliminating the poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections by their support and cosponsorship in the Senate last year and by their aggressive and constructive work this year with the Vermont Legislature.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to explain the Vermont situation in a little more detail. The Senate of the Vermont Legislature unanimously approved this constitutional amendment many weeks ago—I believe on February 6. It was then referred to the house. There was some opposition in the house from an organization which does not believe in

this constitutional amendment. It was successful in postponing action on it.

Yesterday there was a vote in the Vermont House with the result which has just been stated by the senior Senator from Florida, 157 to 63. That vote, however, permitted the amendment to be brought before the House for a third reading today. It is my understanding that the amendment passed the Vermont House without opposition this morning; that there was no vote recorded against it, although I expect there were a few members who were still against it. Nevertheless, they were completely ineffective.

I wish to say something more. The senior Senator from Florida has referred to the work of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which started more than 30 years ago. It is my understanding that 26 years ago, in 1937, when the senior Senator was a member of his State's senate, he started to work toward the same objective in the Florida Legislature. I think that now, when his objective seems fair to be accomplished, we ought really to respect the long years of effort which have been devoted by the senior Senator from Florida to making it possible for all people to vote for President, Vice President, and Federal officials without making the payment of a poll tax a condition for their voting.

The senior Senator from Florida has performed an outstanding service, even if it is taking well over 25 years to accomplish it, and his goal is now in sight. I know the satisfaction he must feel that what he foresaw years ago as a necessary change in the Constitution is now on the way to accomplishment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the more than kind statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I am not ready, as we say in the South, to throw up my hat yet, because we still have 16 more States to go. But we are hoping for ratification by those additional 16 States at a relatively early date. We are working toward that end, just as the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and his distinguished colleague [Mr. PROUTY] have worked so effectively in securing the action of the Vermont Legislature, which was completed just this morning.

I do not believe we would have had success with the Vermont Legislature had it not been for the determination, persistence, and continued efforts of the distinguished Senators from Vermont. I salute them upon their success.

Mr. AIKEN. My only regret is that Vermont was not the third State. It could not possibly have been the first or second, because the Vermont Legislature was not in session at that time. I regret that Vermont had to be the 21st or 22d, instead of the 3d State, which it could have been had the Vermont House not been delayed in reaching a final vote on the question. However, I am much gratified to report that the amendment passed the Vermont House on third reading this morning without opposition, as I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. In completing my statement, I am not surprised to find that there are determined and persistent people in Vermont. We have seen evidence of the fact that Vermont produces that breed of sons. I am glad that by their continued effort the two Senators from Vermont have been able to persuade some of their fellow citizens in Vermont to a better solution and conclusion than seemed to have been possible just a few days ago.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to state my concurrence in the views expressed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] about my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is the author of the constitutional amendment. Had it not been for his tenacity, determination, and strong belief that this was a forward and progressive step, even among the Southern States, as well as throughout the United States, toward giving the people greater voting privileges, the objective would not be so near accomplishment.

As my colleague has said, he is not yet prepared to throw up his hat. There is still some ground to be covered. However, I am satisfied that he and others who believe with him in this endeavor will see to it that it is accomplished, and that finally we shall have in Florida the proud realization that one of our most distinguished sons is the author of a constitutional amendment. There are only 22 constitutional amendments now. I do not know exactly in what States they originated. But I believe that very few States have the honor of having had represent them those who were in point of fact the authors of such a useful, beneficial constitutional amendment as I know the one which has been introduced by my colleague from Florida will be.

I join with the able Senator from Vermont in his expression of commendation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am most grateful to my colleague from Florida for his kind words.

Since he came to the Senate, which I believe was in January 1951, he has been a cosponsor and coauthor of this amendment since almost the first day, in every session of the Senate, and in every Congress since that time. If there be any credit eventually, he is entitled to a full share of it.

WASHINGTON POST SERIES DESCRIBES INDIAN PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I called the attention of the Senate to the first two installments of an excellent series of articles by Mr. Aubrey A. Graves currently appearing in the Washington Post. Mr. Graves has given us a superb account of some of the basic problems, achievements, and prospects of the Oglala Sioux Indians of South Dakota.

These articles in effect are a description of the Indian problem as a whole. I strongly urge the Members of Congress

and others interested in this most important field to read Mr. Graves' articles thoughtfully.

I ask unanimous consent that the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth installments of these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1963]
NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, III—OGLALA SIOUX FIGHT POVERTY AND DISEASE

(By Aubrey Graves)

Now that the emphasis has shifted from resettlement to reservation improvement, are Indians still so miserably housed that they have been dying from the extreme cold of this bitter winter?

In a nation burdened with food surpluses, can it be that American Indians are starving to death, or even going hungry?

The answers to these two questions were among the objectives of my recent 4-day visit to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in southwestern South Dakota. Here live the Oglala Sioux, one of the largest and most poverty-stricken Indian communities in the Nation.

To the first question, the answer is yes. As for the second, some Indians are going hungry at times but it is not due to lack of a food distribution program.

Because of exposure, improper diet, and unsanitary conditions, the infant mortality at Pine Ridge is shockingly high—44 deaths per 1,000 live births. This compares with a mortality rate of 26 among non-Indian babies throughout the Nation. But even this high rate is an improvement over that for 1954, when 66 out of every 1,000 Indian infants died before reaching the age of 1.

The average age of Indians at death is 42; the country's non-Indians live to an average age of 62.

The incidence of tuberculosis among Indians, though still high (285 per 100,000 population in 1961) has dropped from 600 per 100,000 in 1954. Ten years ago tuberculosis was the chief cause of Indian deaths. Today it ranks ninth.

Here the comparison with the disease's incidence among all other races in the Nation is striking. For them the figure was 62 in 1954; it is only 37 today.

At Pine Ridge during 1961, the principal causes of death were influenza and pneumonia. Heart diseases were second. In third place were accidents—many resulting from operation of unsafe automobiles and driving while under the influence of alcohol.

Cancer was killer No. 4.

Next come dysentery and diarrhea, which are directly attributable to the lack of sanitation. The Indians at Pine Ridge (except for those moving into 51 new public housing units) have no water systems; water is hauled from wells in cans and buckets and, because of the hardships of carrying it, often from considerable distances, water is not used freely. Human wastes are disposed of, for the greater part, in primitive privies or directly onto the ground.

Trachoma (an infection of the eye which can cause blindness) is common. Measles and whooping cough are prominent killers.

Projects are under way to improve conditions in the village of Pine Ridge. Under the Sanitary Facilities Act, Public Law 8-6121, \$295,000 has been made available for a water supply system and \$240,000 for a sewage disposal project, both designed to accommodate 440 homes.

Individual running-water-and-sink-units, from well to kitchen, are being planned for four reservation communities: Kyle, Mander-son, Allen, and Wakpamni Lake. At Calico a \$18,500 project, nearing completion, will pro-

vide about a dozen families with a central water supply.

At the Pine Ridge Hospital, the U.S. Public Health Service staff consists of 8 physicians, 19 registered nurses, 13 practical nurses and a ward clerk. Working in field clinics are four PHS nurses, two practical nurses, three dentists, and one nutritionist.

"Pneumonia is our greatest difficulty," said Dr. James Morphis, a young North Carolinian who has been the resident pediatrician for 6 years. The hospital has a capacity of 48 beds but more than 70 filled beds were jammed in rooms and corridors the day I was there.

"And there's lots of ear trouble," Dr. Morphis continued. "Babies are brought in with visibly infected ears. Mothers seem to regard this as a normal condition. It is hard to make them understand that such neglect can lead to deafness, meningitis, and other diseases—and sometimes death.

"Children are brought in with arms and legs full of running sores."

He reported a great incidence of rickets: "The Indian mothers breast feed their babies until they are 3, in the mistaken belief they cannot get pregnant as long as their babies are nursing. Then, at 3, the babies are put on bottles until they are 4 or 5 years old. Milk is not a complete diet; a great many children become anemic."

Because of the enormous scope of their job, trying to protect the health of 8,303 human beings, the doctors and nurses often feel frustrated.

"But there are also rewards," Dr. Morphis said. "A little peanut will come in here, undernourished, full of sores and shriveled up. In a couple of weeks we have him fattened up and his mother takes him home."

The discouraging thing is that in many, many instances, "in a few more weeks the child is back here again."

Sometimes, because of lack of transportation or gumbolike roads, mothers cannot get their babies to the hospital for several days after they become acutely ill. At other times sheer neglect is to blame. "They'll leave their kids in the rattletrap autos outside a bar in cold weather. And they will go away from home, leaving 6-year-old baby-sitters in charge."

Unwed mothers present a disheartening, continuing problem. "For an unmarried woman to have four or five children by as many fathers is not unusual," Dr. Morphis said. "In cases where the mothers show both desire and ability to take care of their babies, they are left with them." Otherwise, they are placed in foster homes both on and off the reservation.

Six babies of unwed mothers were at the hospital, up for adoption, the day I was there.

"We have just about run out of foster homes," said Dr. Morphis.

Under a project conducted by the child welfare league, some children are sent to two adoption agencies in New York City and one in Delaware.

On the subject of food, Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash recently said: "If any American Indians are starving, it is because someone isn't doing his job."

The Oglala Sioux Tribe operates a surplus commodity program in cooperation with the South Dakota Department of Public Instruction.

During my visit, I saw surplus foods (real butter, dry milk, lard, cheese, rice, beans, flour, cornmeal, peanut butter, rolled oats, and chopped meat) being doled out on a ration basis that seemed liberal. In fiscal 1962 the wholesale value of such commodities distributed on Pine Ridge was \$327,567.

But there are two difficulties.

The food is made available once a month, and some families tend to gorge for the first

2 or 3 weeks—going hungry for 10 days or so as a result.

The second cause of whatever hunger exists is the fact that surplus food is not always eaten by the recipients.

Bartering food is strictly forbidden, under pain of being cut off the dole list. Nevertheless, surplus food does find its way to off-reservation bars where a 3-pound head of the finest cheese may go for a six-pack of beer or a bottle of cheap wine.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1963]
NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, IV—LIQUOR IS BIG PROBLEM OF SIOUX, HARD-DRINKING HUNTERS OF OLD

(By Aubrey Graves)

The repeal by Congress in 1953 of the law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians anywhere under any circumstances created new problems on the great majority of reservations.

A notable exception was the Pueblos of New Mexico, who were mostly farmers. After the white man came in, there was not a breakdown in their culture comparable with that suffered by most of the tribes.

The Pueblos kept right on farming. Today, excessive drinking among them is not the problem it is on, say, the Oglala Sioux Reservation in South Dakota.

In the old way of life, the Sioux women performed the labor; the males provided the meat and fought. When the buffalo herds were killed off, their role of hunter also ended. The warriors no longer had a part to play in the economy of the tribe.

IDLENESS ENCOURAGED

For more than a generation after the Sioux wars of the 1870's, the Federal Government encouraged idleness and dependence through a ration system. At regular intervals, heads of families received handouts of food and clothing. The ration system was sharply reduced after 1910 and it had closed down entirely by 1930.

Seeking an escape from depressing realities, the more desperate Sioux (and their brothers on most other reservations) turned to the bottle. As one observer put it: "When a Sioux drinks, he drinks hard."

After 1953, the sale of liquor to an Indian off the reservation in a wet State was no longer illegal. On the reservations, the various Indian tribes had the option of keeping absolute prohibition or letting liquor in, but in such a way as not to violate State laws. In other words, liquor could not be sold to Indians on a reservation in a dry State.

In 1954, the Oglala Sioux men and women of voting age voted in the ratio of 11 to 7 to retain prohibition within the boundaries of their reservation although in adjoining areas of South Dakota and Nebraska intoxicating beverages were and are legally sold.

CONSPICUOUS MINORITY

Any faithful account of conditions on the Oglala Sioux Reservation must make it clear that alcoholism is a serious problem there. The offenders, to be sure, are a minority—but a conspicuous one.

Sit through a morning in the tribal court presided over by Chief Judge John Richard and you find that 95 percent of all the cases he and his associate judges hear stem from liquor, with drunk driving the chief offense.

Those convicted are fined \$50 and jailed for 30 days. "And it doesn't do them a damn bit of good," declared Richard, himself half Indian and an influential member of the tribe. "Turn them loose and within a week they're right back in here."

Church membership is high at Pine Ridge. Of the members, about half are Roman Catholics (the Black Robes, as he called the early missionaries, were invited to establish a mission by Chief Red Cloud in 1888). The others who are affiliated with churches are

Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Seventh-Day Adventists, in that order.

Many Indians are teetotalers, a notable example being Dick Whirlwind Horse, the tribal president. His predecessor, Johnson Holy Rock, also was an abstainer. Generally, the tribal members, whether they themselves drink or not, insist on electing to high tribal office only men known for their sobriety.

The churches teach moderation and a small alcoholics chapter is at work on the reservation. Despite their conscientious efforts, however, there is much drunkenness.

Bring up the subject, as I did, with welfare workers, ministers, Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel, doctors and tribal leaders and all acknowledge the magnitude of the problem and discuss it freely.

Over and over you hear that the Indian gets drunk because he is unbearably frustrated, pitifully poor, miserably housed, jobless, bored stiff and simply not equipped to deal with conditions of life he must face.

Despite prohibition in the village of Pine Ridge, one does not have to be exceptionally resourceful to find a bootlegger nearby.

OASIS 2 MILES AWAY

Or, 2 miles south of the reservation, across the Nebraska line, is the community of White Clay, where bars—and sometimes lawlessness—flourish. The prudent stranger does not linger around this sordid oasis after dark.

Here whisky-craving Indians come in their \$50 jalopies (some without brakes, mirrors, lights or horns) and get tanked up. Some, I was told by a tribesman, tend to revert to savagery when very drunk.

In the bars at White Clay the Indian is served drinks as long as his ability to pay or barter holds out. Nebraska police, according to reservation residents, do not go into the bars and intercede to keep a South Dakota Indian from drinking too much.

But usually, 'tis said, they are not far away when the unfortunate staggers, or is thrown, out. He is tossed into jail, held there until his \$50 fine is paid and then released—unless his friends manage to hustle him back onto the reservation ahead of the gendarmes.

TWO THOUSAND MILES OF HIGHWAYS

Once on the reservation, his risk of arrest decreases. Here there are 2,000 miles of highways many of them all but impassable at times, and only 14 officers (7 tribal officers and 7 furnished by the BIA) to patrol them.

There is growing sentiment at Pine Ridge for legalizing, and taxing, liquor sales in tribally controlled stores—as a means of keeping the inherent problems (including the Indian money Nebraska collects in fines) on the reservation where they could be "better controlled."

Among leaders who hold this view is Father John Bryde, principal of the Holy Rosary Mission, where 546 Indian children live and study for 9 months a year.

"Legalized, controlled whisky sales would be better," insists Father Bryde, "than having drunk-driving hazards strung out, as they now are, over many miles of public highways."

"The Indian," the priest continued, "has no tradition of social drinking. He doesn't take a couple of martinis before dinner and leave it at that. He drinks until the bottle is empty. Provided with an opportunity to drink at home, perhaps after the novelty of it had worn off, he would learn to control his drinking."

Father Bryde also stressed the financial advantages: "The Indians would get their liquor for about one-fourth the price they now pay and it would be better to have the \$50 fines remain on the reservation where they could help build homes for orphans and the aged, rather than benefit the coffers of Nebraska."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, V—INDIANS BLAME ALLOTMENT ACT FOR THEIR ECONOMIC WOES

(By Aubrey Graves)

For their sorry economic plight today, Indian tribes of the Midwest and Northwest blame the General Allotment Act of 1887. Under it, surplus tribal lands were allotted to individual Indians and held in trust for them by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Individual Indians, beginning in 1902, had the right to sell their holdings if the original allottee had died and if the Interior Secretary approved the sale as being in the Indian's best interest. Later, only the Secretary's approval was needed.

If the Secretary disapproved, the Indian still had the right to petition Congress and, as a result, many private bills were passed conveying to specific Indians the right to dispose of their lands.

The net result has been to enable white cattlemen and farmers to acquire ownership of a substantial, if not a major, portion of the land on many reservations.

The case of the Oglala Sioux Indian Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., is illustrative. Today 45 percent of its area is held by white owners and more than 75 percent of all the land of the original reservation is either owned, or being used, by non-Indians.

Originally, the Oglala Sioux Reservation contained 2,721,597 acres; it has been whittled to 1,525,835, much of which is leased to non-Indians.

Particularly in the Southwest, notably New Mexico and Arizona, there was strong tribal resistance to individual allotments, and there the reservations as originally established have remained in tribal control.

But on reservations where allotments were made, substantial land losses occurred in successive waves. One came around 1910 when, in the case of the Oglala Sioux, most of the good farmland, on the eastern end of the reservation, was sold off to white settlers.

There were more losses in the 1920's. These came to a halt in 1934 after passage by Congress of the Indian Reorganization Act "to conserve and develop Indian lands and resources." Interior Secretary Harold Ickes flatly refused to sanction further transfers to non-Indians. Because of successful pressure by grass-hungry Western stockmen, and Indians who wanted to sell, land sales were resumed in 1948.

After many tracts of choice grazing land had passed out of Indian ownership, sales to non-Indians came to a halt in the late 1950's with the gradual abandonment of termination policies.

Since 1959 the Federal Government has assisted the tribes financially to enable them to purchase key tracts of land when individual Indians put them up for sale.

Under the present program, purchases are made by the tribe with money available from the Indian Revolving Loan Fund. This tribal enterprise operates at a profit and over a period of years the Federal loans will be repaid. Meantime, the lands are being used for the economic development of the Indian community.

Ninety percent of the money Indians received for the land they sold to white men was quickly spent—without lasting benefit to the Indians who sold it. Some who have disposed of all their land now exist precariously, largely as recipients of welfare programs.

During the years when resettlement of Indians off the reservation was the big idea, there was no consistent, continuing program to help the Indians use their lands.

Again, the experience of the Oglala Sioux is typical. A recent BIA survey shows that,

of their 1,900 family units, only 126 graze their own cattle on their own acreage or on land leased from other Indians.

Another 450 families lease range and farm land, mostly to non-Indians who pay them \$15.50 to \$20.50 per head per year.

Income from unit leases for 1962 distributed by BIA as of last December amounted to \$873,608 (\$579,909 from grazing fees, \$287,538 from farm land rentals and \$6,161 from hay permits). This averages out to \$1,941 for the year for each of the land-leasing families.

On permanent, year-round relief are 246 family groups. Some Indians are on BIA's payroll or work in the village of Pine Ridge. The remainder, except for the 224 heads of families who tie fishhooks for Wright & McGill, live mostly by part-time, seasonal work off the reservation, supplemented by relief payments during idle months.

The Oglala Sioux had no experience as cattlemen or farmers. Actually, it would have been impossible for a family to make a living off its holdings. Allotments were 160 acres. From 24 to 26 acres of South Dakota grazing land are required to support 1 cow. The natural thing was to lease the holdings to white cattlemen who were big operators.

No allotments were made after 1934.

Today the Oglala Sioux Tribe holds 362,144 acres; allotments in trust to 4,573 Indians amount to 1,163,691 acres. Of the allotments, about three-fourths are in heirship (multiple ownership).

Responding to an invitation extended by President Kennedy during his campaign for election, the Oglala Sioux presented BIA with a proposed land reform program. Its gist was that their remaining land base must be retained and developed in Indian ownership, "so that the Oglala Sioux people will always have a home."

Formation of a Domestic Peace Corps would be provided for in legislation now before Congress. Already, the tribe has invited the Corps to send volunteers to Pine Ridge to instruct Indians in, among other things, land use and management, including irrigation farming. Pine Ridge has been given first priority.

The corpsmen will also assist in developing self-help housing, day care centers for children and recreation programs. The tribal council envisions the extended presence of corpsmen as embodying the person-to-person service pattern so long sought by concerned Indian leaders.

The tribe, working with the Realty Branch of BIA, is already embarked upon a program to consolidate various undivided inherited interests of Indians into contiguous tracts.

The method is to trade scattered and fragmentary heirship holdings to the tribe in exchange for a single usable entity of equal size or value that can be managed according to needs and desires of a single individual, rather than the often conflicting interests of many heirs.

There are only 577 tracts in which there are more than 15 heirs. There are only an additional 900 tracts in which there are more than 5 heirs.

Clearing these tracts of heirship status and exchanging them for consolidated tracts has the virtue of requiring no exchange of money. And it would greatly reduce the BIA's administrative workload in managing allotments.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, VI—1962 LAW SPARKS SIOUX ADVANCE

(By Aubrey Graves)

A special law sponsored by Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, and passed

by Congress last year, amended the Accelerated Public Works Act so as to make American Indians eligible for Federal help in developing their homelands, on the same basis as any other American community.

This legislation reflects the conviction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Congress that earlier resettlement policies had failed. Today the accent is on improving living conditions on the reservations and providing vocational education, both on and off the tribal preserves, to fit Indians for jobs wherever they may be found.

The first South Dakota community, Indian or non-Indian, to apply for help under the act was the Oglala Sioux. They came up with plans for a \$200,000 municipal center in the village of Pine Ridge, for smaller community buildings in five outlying areas, each to cost about \$35,000 and for a \$45,000 youth camp.

The Pine Ridge building would include a tribal council meeting room, a bowling alley, a gymnasium suitable for basketball games and dances, and a kitchen to be used by homemakers' clubs.

NEW PLAYGROUND

Tribe plans also call for enlisting the aid of the Domestic Peace Corps in setting up a complete recreational program for adolescents and young adults now sadly lacking, based on the municipal centers.

An Oglala Sioux project, already authorized, is the \$300,000 Felix S. Cohen Memorial Home for the Aged, named after the attorney who formerly represented the tribe in Washington.

It will have 21 rooms accommodating 42 persons. (No Sioux voluntarily lives alone.) Funds have been obtained through the Public Housing Administration. Old-age pensions received by occupants will pay for their room and board, with margins left for other necessities.

All these plans grew out of a self-appraisal that tribal officials conducted about 5 years ago. They found that of the 1,900 or so families on Pine Ridge, which is typical of other reservations, not more than one-third were economically and socially well adjusted.

The remaining two-thirds constituted a chronic problem of poverty, disease, and social maladjustment reflected in broken homes, alcoholism, and a disturbing crime rate.

ASSISTANCE FROM BUREAU

Assistance and improvement programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, other than welfare grants, covered principally (1) education, (2) business loans, particularly to put tribal members in the cattle business, and (3) relocation.

Valuable as far as they went, these helped only the fairly well adjusted people. They made little dent on the two-thirds who were poorly adjusted. These were the people who dropped out of school and those who did complete school but were unable to find anything useful to do with their education.

These were also the people who failed if they were set up in the cattle business and those who failed in relocation.

The one-third group was being helped to move closer to complete adjustment to the general American culture. But the two-thirds were falling further behind.

Social rules of the older Indian culture, they found, were discarded as the younger generation rejected its parents. But nothing took their place. The Indian youths were rootless and aimless.

PILOT PROGRAM PROPOSED

The tribe drew up plans for reservation improvement and moved to put them into effect. The Oglala Sioux proposed that a pilot program be initiated on their reservation, designed to create a healthier climate for human development by providing a better economic foundation.

Leslie Towle, BIA superintendent at Pine Ridge, was, and is, uniformly well liked, trusted, and respected. The tribal council unanimously adopted a resolution of appreciation of his work. His presence, it argued, made the situation at Pine Ridge ideal for a cooperative venture by the tribe and the Bureau.

The program moved forward. Although some skeptics argued that industries would not locate on the reservation, Wright & McGill fishhook plants did move in and are operating at a profit.

Plans for further economic development are on the drawing board. The tribe is particularly interested in developing recreational opportunities on the reservation and attracting tourists.

TRIBE WANTS MOTEL

The Black Hills interest many tourists. Some would like to stay on the Pine Ridge Reservation, it was felt, if adequate facilities were available for them. So the tribe wants to build a motel and furnish Indian guides to take visitors on horseback through the Badlands, which lie within the reservation.

In Pine Ridge village it proposes to create additional job opportunities. In the works are plans for a motel there, also a supermarket, a barber and beauty shop, a bakery, laundry, and restaurant. Virtually all reservation shopping is now done in Nebraska towns, at great inconvenience and travel costs.

SECRETARY McNAMARA DESERVES SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S BACKERS IN SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers carry an attack by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] on the action of the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, in connection with the award of a contract for the so-called TFX all-purpose warplane to General Dynamics Corp.

I support the Secretary of Defense. In my opinion, the chief of any Government agency is entitled to a presumption that he acts in the public interest. The supporters of President Kennedy—and I count myself one—should be slow, indeed, to condemn Secretary of Defense McNamara for the decision he made in the TFX case. This is particularly true in the light of the vast experience of the Secretary in the field of procurement, both when he was a top executive of the Ford Motor Co. and since he has become Secretary of Defense.

I suggest that civilian control over the military is at stake in the TFX case. Our law and our practices require that the Secretary of Defense, not Air Force, or Navy officers, is entitled, in our democracy, to make the final decision in a case like the present one.

We should be constantly on guard against the efforts of the military-industrial complex in this country to force on us their views as to defense expenditures.

In my judgment, President Eisenhower was clearly right when he warned the country against the danger of domination by this powerful establishment. Mr. President, all the establishments in the world are not in the U.S. Senate; there are some outside it.

All of us are aware of service divisiveness. For years the Army, the Navy, and

the Air Force have tended to go their separate ways. Now the Secretary of Defense makes a decision which, in his opinion, will give us one all-purpose tactical warplane for the Navy and the Air Force, in the least time, at the least risk, and with the least cost. I, for one, will be slow, indeed, to disagree with him. From where I sit, it looks as though the Secretary is right.

Surely, he was correct in his instructions to his subordinates that the proposed plane should first, satisfy both the Navy and the Air Force that they would get a significantly improved warplane; second, provide minimum divergence from a one-plane concept; and, third, provide realistic cost estimates.

Secretary McNamara tells us that his decision will save the taxpayers \$1 billion.

Even in a day when we are spending \$1 billion a day for our defense program, this is a not insignificant sum. Secretary McNamara chose General Dynamics Corp. over the Boeing Co., because the latter company's proposal "simply did not meet the fundamental requirement of minimum divergence from a common design" and, in the long run, would cost the taxpayers more money.

Mr. President, I hope the Presidential party in the Senate will rally behind the President's Secretary of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a very able news article, published yesterday in the Washington Post, under the byline of John G. Norris, outlining Secretary McNamara's stand before the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]
TFX AWARD BEST, McNAMARA SAYS—DEFENDS CHOICE OF GENERAL DYNAMICS

(By John G. Norris)

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara said yesterday that he had chosen General Dynamics Corp. to develop the all-purpose TFX warplane because he felt it could do the job in the least time, at the least risk and at the least cost.

He told Congress in a detailed statement that a purportedly lower bid by the rival Boeing Co. was based on unreliable cost estimates and, in effect, contemplated building two separate airplanes for the Air Force and Navy.

CITES \$1 BILLION SAVING

McNamara made it very clear that throughout the long competition he had insisted on the Air Force and Navy developing one tactical fighter—suitable for land and carrier use with minimum changes—because it should save the Nation \$1 billion.

Selection of the Boeing proposal, he said, would have evaporated the prospects of such a saving.

The Defense Secretary sent his lengthy chronicle of the TFX program to the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee to be read by an aide. He had protested that the American people were getting a wrong and harmful impression of the matter and of Pentagon chiefs by the piecemeal evidence produced before the subcommittee.

DISCREPANCIES SEEN

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the group, issued a

statement at the same time, declaring that there were discrepancies between McNamara's statement and other facts before the subcommittee, including an earlier Pentagon memorandum submitted for the record.

"Testimony of Defense Department witnesses," declared McCLELLAN, "shows that the Government evaluated Boeing's design as superior in operational capacity in that it had a 1,100-mile greater ferry range, more than 50 percent greater weapon-carrying capability, and the ability to land at low speeds on carrier flight decks and short airstrips."

McCLELLAN said McNamara will be called later for cross-examination on this, or evidence that the Boeing cost estimates were lower, and on some errors brought out about the cost estimates that the Secretary did not discuss.

At the same time, the Senate group released some earlier testimony given in a closed session by George Spangenberg, a Navy aircraft evaluation expert, who said that McNamara had dictated what the requirements for the TFX should be. He said the Navy feels the final TFX design is satisfactory, but declared that separate airplanes would be better for both services.

"We do not think that they fully meet the operational requirements initially established by the Navy, and we do not think they meet the combined requirements of the Air Force and the Navy," said Spangenberg. "And we know they do not meet the initial requirements established by the Secretary of Defense."

POORER PLANE SEEN

The many changes made in the designs submitted by both General Dynamics and Boeing over the long competition, the Navy evaluation expert said, will produce a "poorer" plane than the one originally demanded. Boeing's design comes closer to the original specifications, he added.

McNamara's statement conceded that Navy and Air Force officers always seek the "ultimate" in performance. But he said this does not take into consideration either the overall cost involved, or the risk of delays if advanced designs prove difficult to perfect.

"I decided to select General Dynamics as the development contractor," he declared, "since I concluded that it was best qualified to design the most effective airplane that could be produced at the least cost, in the least time, to meet our military requirements."

He added that "it should be unnecessary to add that no other considerations entered into my judgment."

The Defense Chief also stressed the fact that he was charged by the President to build the military forces required by the Nation, without regard to arbitrary budget ceilings, but that he also has been instructed to get such forces at the lowest possible cost.

TRIED TO CUT COSTS

In accordance with these instructions, McNamara said, he has been trying to cut the tremendous cost of developing new weapons by refusing to accept unrealistically optimistic cost estimates and two systems where one would do.

When he became Secretary 2 years ago, McNamara said, both the Air Force and Navy planned to develop a new tactical fighter plane. But, he went on, he became convinced that one such fighter could be developed that would meet both services' needs.

Most people in both services, he admitted, "said it couldn't be done," and even after 8 months of mutual discussions, reported to him in August 1961, that developing a single plane to meet the requirements of both "was not technically feasible."

McNamara said this attitude, "based on years of going separate ways," was "understandable" but not a "realistic approach" considering advances in technology. He de-

clared he decided that it was feasible and so insisted over the next 14 months until the two services agreed on a single program.

A source selection board made up of people from both forces was created to review manufacturers' designs, assisted by a 235-man evaluation group of Air Force and Navy experts. Their successive recommendations were reviewed by the regular staffs and weapons commands of the services.

McNamara recounted in detail what the recommendations were at each level in four successive evaluations made of a series of design proposals submitted by the manufacturers.

His account made it plain that statements on Capitol Hill that on four separate occasions the evaluation board recommended Boeing were inaccurate. On the first go-around neither the Boeing plan nor General Dynamics proposal was found suitable, but the board did recommend that Boeing be allowed to go ahead alone with new "design definitions" because its ideas seemed more promising.

But the Air Force Systems Command proposed that both contractors come up with new studies and this was approved. New proposals were submitted April 2, 1962, but the Navy staff took the position, he said, that neither plane would suit its needs and recommended to Navy Secretary Fred Korth that the plan to develop a joint fighter be abandoned.

NEW PROPOSALS ASKED

However, this was rejected and new proposals called for. This time, Navy evaluation experts again ruled that neither met Navy needs. But both Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, recommended that Boeing alone be allowed to come up with new designs.

At this point, McNamara said, he concluded that not only were neither contractors meeting Navy requirements, but that his "primary goal" of developing one airplane was "not accepted or not fully understood" by the Navy and Air Force.

Therefore, for the fourth and last design proposal, Boeing and General Dynamics were given firm new instructions of what was wanted. They must:

Satisfy both the Navy and Air Force that they would get a "significantly" improved plane.

Provide "minimum divergence" from the one-airplane concept.

Provide realistic cost estimates.

When the fourth evaluation report was presented, approved by LeMay and Anderson, McNamara said, both the General Dynamics and Boeing designs were held to be "acceptable" with some further development. But, the Secretary added, the report "did not choose as between the contractors" because the advantages and disadvantages of each came out "very close."

His own review of the proposals, McNamara said, convinced him that the Boeing proposal was far inferior to General Dynamics on the second and third criteria he had laid down.

FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENT

"Boeing simply did not meet the fundamental requirement of minimum divergence from a common design," he declared. "No amount of peripheral technical argument should be permitted to obscure this central and crucial fact."

Boeing was still proposing what amounted to two airplanes, the Secretary said.

Furthermore, the Boeing plan called for some "technically risky" innovations in design to achieve better performance, including the use of titanium and untried engine thrust reversers to slow down in flight or in landing. The General Dynamics proposal, he said, followed more conventional lines.

While the new Boeing features were not "insuperable obstacles," McNamara said, they introduced problems that the company's cost estimates and development schedule did not allow for.

He said that Boeing, experienced only in building big bombers and transports, "simply did not understand the complexities" of supersonic fighters, as did General Dynamics and its affiliate, Grumman, long time fighter manufacturers.

In deciding the issue, McNamara concluded, he had to "balance the promises held out by competing contractors, against the hopes and aspirations of military officers and the limiting realities of economics and technology."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Although at one time when I served on the Armed Services Committee, I undertook to find out something about defense costs, I know nothing whatever about the technical facts in dispute between the Boeing Co. and the General Dynamics Corp. I do believe, however, that we should recognize that whenever someone states what he bid on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, the bid is absolutely meaningless, because he does not have to produce the article for that amount. The actual cost would have to be estimated by the person responsible for negotiating this contract; and the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows that these cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts—different from a contract on which one bids a specific price—are mere estimates of the cost, and sometimes the estimate can be 100 percent wrong.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution.

SECURITIES HELD BY SENATOR CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it will be recalled that last year I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of my financial holdings. I did so because I felt then, and I feel strongly now, that across the country there is widespread criticism of Senators, on the ground that too often we have a conflict of interest with respect to votes which we may be called upon to cast, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

A number of other Senators have also filed, for the public record, statements of their financial holdings. I commend them for doing so, and I hope the number will grow as time goes on.

Clearly, Mr. President, with respect to conflict of interest we impose on the executive branch higher standards than those we impose on ourselves. It may well be that in due course we should pass a conflict-of-interest law applying to ourselves and to the Members of the other body. But certainly a first step would be complete public disclosure of what our financial interests are, so that it may be determined whether, when we vote, we are violating the principle of a conflict-of-interest situation.

There have been a few changes in my list of holdings since my last statement appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I have brought it up to date; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I add the footnote that the oil royalties paid to me by the Humble Oil & Refining Co. on wells drilled on my family property in Louisiana are the principal source of my income outside my Senate salary.

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

LIST OF SECURITIES HELD BY SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, OF PENNSYLVANIA, JANUARY 1, 1963

COMMON STOCKS

American Telephone & Telegraph: 100 shares.
 Armstrong Cork: 160 shares.
 Avery Island, Inc.: 800 shares.
 First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co.: 490 shares.
 Franklin Life Insurance Co.: 55 shares.
 Insurance Co. of North America: 100 shares.
 International Business Machines: 19 shares.
 Johns-Manville: 150 shares.
 Oxford Paper Co.: 300 shares.
 Pepsi-Cola Co.: 100 shares.
 Rohm & Haas Co.: 91 shares.
 Scott Paper Co.: 12 shares.
 Sel-Rex Corp.: 100 shares.

PREFERRED STOCK

Newmont Mining Corp., 4-percent cumulative preferred: 150 shares.

BONDS

Allegh Co., Pennsylvania Peoples Rd. Bond: 15M.
 Ambler Jt. high school auth., Montgomery County, Pa.: 5M.
 Bethlehem School Dist. Counties of Northampton & Lehigh: 2M.
 City of Philadelphia, Pa., loan of July 8, 1929: 10M.
 City of Philadelphia, Pa., loan of August 4, 1949: 15M.
 City of Lebanon, Pa., 2.30 percent gen. obligation imp.: 10M.
 Com. Pennsylvania Turnpike rev. ref. and ext. bonds: 4M.
 Cumberland Co. inst. dist. gen. obl. series of 1959: 15M.
 Gettysburg School Authority Adams County, Pa., sch. rev.: 5M.
 Haverford twp. school dist. auth. Pennsylvania: 5M.
 Pennsylvania State Public School Building Auth. 3½ percent: 5M.
 Radnor twp. school dist. auth., Delaware County, Pa.: 5M.
 State hwy and bridge auth. of Com. Pennsylvania 2½ percent: 10M.
 State hwy and bridge auth. of Com. Pennsylvania 3½ percent: 10M.
 West Coshen sewer auth. Pennsylvania 3 percent: 5M.

MISCELLANEOUS

Bayhill fund.
 Oil royalties paid by Humble Oil & Refining Co. on wells drilled on Clark family property at Avery Island, La.

POPULATION GROWTH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it has often been said that the two most critical problems confronting the world today are the imminent danger, in which we live, of having our civilization destroyed by a nuclear holocaust result-

ing from war between the United States and Soviet Russia. This is the first problem. The second is the undeniable fact that two out of every three human beings will go to bed hungry tonight. The latter fact places in high order of priority the problem of population control. This is a controversial subject and one on which, in my opinion, our Government has been slow to speak out.

However, I have before me two statements made earlier this year, before the United Nations, by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, in Committee II of the United Nations—that is to say, the Economic and Financial Committee—during the course of the debate on the item "Population growth and economic development." I believe these statements indicate a somewhat new policy on behalf of the United States in this controversial area. I commend our Government for moving forward in this area; and I commend Mr. Gardner, as our spokesman.

I call particular attention to the summary of the U.S. policy which appears near the end of the first statement; and I ask unanimous consent that the two statements and the summary be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

POPULATION GROWTH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Following are two statements made by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, in Committee II (Economic and Financial) during debate on the item "Population growth and economic development," together with the text of a resolution adopted in plenary session on December 18.)

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 10

The United States welcomes the initiative of the cosponsors of the resolution now before us¹ in drawing further attention to the subject of population growth and its relation to economic development. This is a subject of transcendent importance for the United Nations and all its members.

There are today some 3 billion people in the world. It required hundreds of thousands of years, from the beginning of life on earth to the beginning of this century to reach 1½ billion. Within the last 60 years we have doubled that number. According to United Nations estimates we will double that number again to 6 billion by the end of this century.

It is obvious from these statistics that the world's population is not merely growing in absolute numbers. The rate of population growth has increased at an extraordinary pace. The annual growth rate has doubled from 1 percent in 1945—its own unprecedented high in world history—to 2 percent today. It is expected to go even higher. But even if the present rate of growth of world population is maintained at its present level, the numbers we have to contemplate are staggering.

Whether the growth of world population continues at its present rate, whether a reduction in that rate is brought about by increases in the death rate or decreases in the birth rate, and whether, to reduce the birth rate, measures are found which are consistent with the economic, cultural, ethical, and religious circumstances of the

members of the United Nations—these are all questions of paramount importance.

The resolution before us is entitled "Population Growth and Economic Development." The United States agrees with the sponsors of this resolution that the impact of population growth on economic development and of economic development on population growth is a subject deserving of increased attention. Our governments are pledged under articles 55 and 56 of the charter to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the United Nations for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations—including higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

In the opinion of my Government progress toward these high aims of the United Nations Charter cannot be measured merely by increases in gross national product. The object of economic development is the welfare and dignity of the individual human being. We must concern ourselves, not with aggregate statistics, but with progress made in assuring each person a full and satisfactory life—adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education, and also satisfaction of those political, cultural, and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

If the condition of the individual, and not gross statistics, is to be the measure of our progress, then it is absolutely essential that we be concerned with population trends. Population changes are one of the most important single factors determining our progress or lack of progress toward the high aims of the United Nations Charter. So long as we are concerned with the quality of life we have no choice but to be concerned with the quantity of life.

Experience of California

We believe these statements are true not just for some but for all nations. My own country, blessed though it is with abundant resources and high living standards, recognizes the fundamental importance of the population factor in its efforts at economic and social development.

Within the United States our local, State, and Federal governments are all devoting attention to population trends as part of their planning for the improvement of individual welfare. This is true in areas of great wealth as well as in areas less fortunately endowed. For example, California, a region which has one of the highest living standards in the entire world, has been obliged to pay increasing attention to population trends. The total population of the State, now something over 17 million, is increasing at an average annual rate of about 3.8 percent. It has approximately doubled its population every 20 years over the past century. About 60 percent of the present growth results from migrations; natural increase adds almost 250,000 new residents annually out of the total annual growth of about 600,000 persons.

Three aspects of California's rapid population growth are shared with other regions of the United States and with other countries of the world. First, it involves large-scale internal migration—the movement of about a third of a million people annually from other parts of the Nation—rather than international migration. Second, population gains are concentrated in the urban areas, which account for about 90 percent of the growth, so that 86.4 percent of the State population was reported as urban in the 1960 census. Third, the high growth rate has posed many problems for government—the

¹ U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657 and L.709.

need for more schools, highways, and hospitals, for example, must be considered in terms of the ability to finance construction and operation—and there must be more jobs to provide employment needed to support the new residents.

Faced with these problems, the State government has turned to the analysis of its current population and projected gains as a basis for planning its programs for action. It is also examining the social and economic implications of rapid growth rates in order to employ its human and material resources most effectively in the future. Because an adequate water supply is vital to continued growth, the State is engaged in a multi-billion-dollar project of dams, reservoirs, and canals, the largest State-financed water project ever undertaken in the United States. A master plan for higher education has been prepared and accepted, and planning for highway needs over the next two decades is well advanced. And a comprehensive study of the economic basis for future growth and development is now underway.

The California experience demonstrates the importance of continued study and analysis of population growth at every level of economic development. The population of the United States as a whole is growing at about 1.7 percent a year—somewhat below the world average—with no foreseeable end in sight. We have come to recognize that this growth has both advantages and disadvantages and that we cannot fail to take account of it in seeking a better life for our citizens, specifically in planning for such things as medical care, education, conservation of natural resources, recreation areas, public housing, and urban transportation.

Population problems of developing countries

Population trends are clearly important for high-income countries in the advanced stages of economic development. As many speakers in this debate have already indicated, population questions may be even more significant for countries in an earlier stage of economic development.

There are at least two reasons why this is so:

In the first place, the rate of population growth in a great many less developed countries is much higher than in developed countries—about 70 percent higher on the average. In many less developed countries the rate of population growth exceeds 3 percent a year. About 80 percent of the one-half-billion growth in world population in the last decade took place in the less developed areas. In the years ahead the highest rates of growth will continue to be in these areas. It is estimated, for example, that, if present rates of growth were to continue, between now and the year 2000 the population of North America would grow from 200 to 300 million, while the population of South and Middle America would grow from some 200 to 600 million.

This extraordinary differential in the rates of growth between more developed and less developed countries reflects some important differences in historical experience. In the countries that are now more developed the effect of improved medical and public-health services came only gradually over many years, while in the case of the newly developing countries these services have recently developed very rapidly with decisive and overwhelming impact. Furthermore, the gradual effect of improved health services in the case of more developed countries came simultaneously with industrialization and rapidly rising living standards which tended to reduce the birth rate and slow the rate of population growth. However, in the case of the newly developing countries, modern medicine and public health have not only hit all at once; they have hit before industrialization and rising living standards have had the

effect—as has been the case in many countries—of reducing the rate of population growth.

Thus, while all countries are concerned with population trends, the population problems of the newly developing countries are of a new and different order from those encountered now or in the past by the more developed countries. For there is little immediate prospect that the factors which reduced the rate of population growth in developed regions such as Europe will take effect in the less developed countries in the immediate future.

In the second place, rapid population growth is obviously of greater concern to countries in an earlier stage of economic development. The problem for developed countries is to increase already relatively high per capita income levels and to devote increasing portions of already large national savings to services such as medical care, health, and housing. But less developed countries whose economy is at the subsistence level may be able to save little or nothing at existing income levels for improvements in social infrastructure.

It is all many of the developing countries can do to enlarge the total economic product as fast as the added people. Yet they have not merely to provide additional facilities for increased population but to create new and adequate facilities for the existing population as well.

For newly developing countries the problem of population growth is not, as some people think, the problem of avoiding starvation or finding standing room. It is the problem of finding sufficient savings after current consumption needs are met to assure a tolerable rate of progress toward modernization and higher standards of living based on self-sustaining economic growth. In some of the world's poorest areas population increase is outpacing the increase in gross national product. As a result there are no resources available for capital formation and no increases in living standards. The prospect is for more and more people to share less and less income.

Just 1 year ago the General Assembly set as its goal for the United Nations Development Decade the attainment by 1970 of an annual growth rate of 5 percent a year in aggregate national income in each of the developing countries. The achievement of this goal will require enormous efforts. It has been estimated that in the decade of the 1950's the developing countries overall had a growth rate of 3 percent a year and a population growth of 2 percent a year, with annual per capita increases in income of 1 percent a year. Making the generally accepted assumption of a capital-output ratio of 3 to 1, these countries will have to increase their savings and investment from 9 to 15 percent in order to achieve the goals of the Development Decade. This is obviously a formidable task at present levels of population growth.

Assuming that the goals of the Development Decade are achieved, prospective increases in population will greatly dilute the impact of overall increases in income on individual levels of welfare. For example, gradual progress toward the 5 percent annual growth goal during the Development Decade would by the end of this decade increase a \$100 per capita income to \$123 in a country with a 2 percent rate of population growth and to \$111 in a country with a 3 percent rate of population growth.

Obviously there is much that we do not know about the relationship of population trends to economic and social development. But from an examination of these and other facts one conclusion seems inescapable—that in certain less-developed countries it may be virtually impossible at the present time, even with maximum external assistance and

maximum self-help, to bring about a rate of economic growth which will provide the rate of improvement in individual living standards which the country seeks to attain and which, more fundamentally, is essential to the exercise of the individual's human faculties.

Summary of U.S. policy

These are facts which the members of the United Nations must take into account in considering the subject now before us. Let me turn now from these facts to define the policies of my Government on this important question. I can summarize these policies as follows:

1. The United States is concerned about the social consequences of its own population trends and is devoting attention to them.

2. The United States wants to know more, and help others to know more, about population trends in less developed countries where present levels of population growth may constitute a major obstacle to the realization of goals of human economic and social development.

3. The United States would oppose any effort to dictate to any country the means to be employed in dealing with its population problem. The population policy of any country must be determined by that country and that country alone.

4. While the United States will not suggest to any other government what its attitudes or policies should be as they relate to population or the adoption of specific measures in its implementation, the United States believes that obstacles should not be placed in the way of other governments which, in the light of their own economic needs and cultural and religious values, seek solutions to their population problems. While we will not advocate any specific policy regarding population growth to another country, we can help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems.

5. The United States believes that there is a great need for additional knowledge on population matters. There is a need for more information about the actual size and composition of existing populations and about future population trends—and both private organizations and governments as well as international organizations can help to provide it. There is a need for more facts about alternative methods of family planning that are consistent with different economic, social, cultural, and religious circumstances. There is a need for more facts about the impact of economic and social development on population trends and of population trends on economic and social development.

6. The United States believes that the United Nations and its affiliated agencies can have a significant role to play in the population field. My Government has actively supported the demographic work of the United Nations from the very early days of the organization and wishes to commend particularly the Population Commission, the Population Branch of the Bureau of Social Affairs, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Economic Commission for Africa, and the Regional Demographic Research and Training Centers for their excellent work. It is the hope of the United States that these valuable efforts will be substantially expanded.

Role of the United Nations

Let me close with more specific observations about the role of the United Nations. The United States believes that member countries should be able to obtain from the United Nations and its agencies such assistance as they may need and request in connection with their efforts to deal with their

population problems. We believe that the United Nations should focus its efforts on three areas: first, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; second, the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and third, the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

In the area of demographic information there is much that remains to be done. The demographic section of the Secretariat was downgraded from a division to a branch in the Secretary-General's 1955 reorganization and its staff substantially reduced. It is time to consider whether the resources being devoted to this subject in the Secretariat are adequate to the needs. We should also consider ways to strengthen the demographic staffs of the regional economic commissions. The commissions are in a particularly good position to extend effective assistance to member governments in the context of the problems of particular regions.

In the field of demographic training much more should be done to train nationals of member governments so that they may acquire the demographic information on which to base sound economic plans. This would include the training of people in census taking, in the making of population projections, and in analyzing the economic and social consequences of demographic statistics. We welcome the establishment by the United Nations of regional demographic research and training centers in Bombay, Santiago, and Cairo and would support the establishment of further centers if they were desired by the countries concerned.

In the field of discussion the United States will continue to play an active role in the work of the Population Commission and the regional commissions of the United Nations. Moreover we look forward with great interest to the Asian population conference scheduled for 1963 and the world population conference later on.

With experience in these forms of collaboration, the needs of individual countries and the present and potential resources of the United Nations would become better known and future collaboration more fruitful.

These, in sum, are the views of the United States on population growth and economic development. We consider the resolution now before the committee to be broadly consistent with these views. We are, accordingly, prepared to give it our support.

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 13

The United States wishes to explain its affirmative votes on the first and second amendments submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain.² In our view these amendments did not constitute significant changes in the substance of the resolution, and we have supported them in the interest of accommodating the views of the widest possible number of members.

The United States also wishes to explain its abstaining vote on the third amendment submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain to delete operative paragraph 6 of the resolution on population growth and economic development.

In the opinion of the United States, operative paragraph 6 does not add or subtract from the authority which the United Nations already possesses as a result of resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council concerning the granting of technical assistance upon request to member nations. In our view, the paragraph is therefore superfluous.

While the United States believes that the authority to lend technical assistance in all aspects of population problems already exists, we also believe, as I stated earlier in the

general debate, that assistance by the United Nations should emphasize those three areas in which there appears to be broad agreement among members, namely, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

It was in the light of these considerations that the United States decided to abstain on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States wishes to explain its votes on the various parts of operative paragraph 6 of the resolution. The United States voted for the phrase "as well as other aspects" because it believes that the United Nations should assist members who wish help in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies in all aspects of their economic and social development. The United States abstained on the phrase "and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by governments, for national projects and programs dealing with the problems of population" for the same reasons it abstained on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States voted for the resolution as a whole because of the importance we attach to the relation between population growth and economic development and because we regard the resolution as broadly consistent with the views of the United States as put forward in our intervention during the general debate.

The text of the resolution³ follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that rapid economic and social progress in the developing countries is dependent, not the least, upon the ability of these countries to provide their peoples with education, a fair standard of living and the possibility for productive work,

"Considering further that economic and social development and population policies are closely interrelated and may be carried out simultaneously to secure maximum benefits,

"Recognizing that the health and welfare of the family is of paramount importance, not only for obvious humanitarian reasons, but also with regard to economic development and social progress, and that the health and welfare of the family require special attention in areas with a relatively high rate of population growth,

"Recognizing further that it is the responsibility of each Government to decide its own policies and devise its own programmes of action for dealing with the problems of population and economic and social progress,

"Reminding States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies that according to recent census results the effective population increase during the last decade has been particularly high in many low-income less developed countries,

"Reminding Member States that in formulating their economic and social policies it is useful to take into account the latest relevant facts on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development and that the forthcoming World Population Conference and the Asian Population Conference might throw new light on the importance of this problem, especially for the developing countries,

² U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657, as revised; adopted in plenary session on Dec. 18 by a vote of 69 (U.S.) to 0, with 27 abstentions. In a separate vote (34 to 34, with 32 abstentions (U.S.)) the following phrase was deleted at the end of operative paragraph 6: " * * * and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by Governments, for national projects and programmes dealing with the problems of population."

"Recalling General Assembly resolution 1217 (XII), which, *inter alia*, invites Member States, particularly the developing countries, to follow as closely as possible the interrelationships existing between economic and population changes, and requests the Secretary-General to ensure the coordination of the activities of the United Nations in the demographic and economic fields,

"Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 820 (XXXI) which contains provisions aiming at intensified efforts to ensure international cooperation in the evaluation, analysis, and utilization of population census results and related data, particularly in the less developed countries, and which requests the Secretary-General to explore the possibilities of increasing the amounts of technical assistance funds which may be made available for these activities,

"Recognizing that further studies and research are necessary to fill the gaps in our knowledge about the causes and consequences of demographic trends, particularly in the less developed countries,

"Recognizing that removals of large national groups to other countries may give rise to ethnical, political, emotional and economic difficulties,

"1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Acting Secretary-General, entitled "The United Nations Development Decade, Proposals for Action" which, *inter alia*, refers to the interrelationship between population growth and economic and social development;

"2. Expresses its appreciation of the work on population problems which has up to now been carried out under the guidance of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to conduct an inquiry among the Governments of States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes;

"4. Recommends that the Economic and Social Council in co-operation with the specialized agencies, the regional economic commissions and the Population Commission, and taking into account the results of the inquiry referred to in paragraph 3 above, intensify its studies and research on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, with particular reference to the needs of the developing countries for investment in health and educational facilities within the framework of their general development programmes;

"5. Further recommends that the Economic and Social Council report on its findings to the General Assembly not later than at its nineteenth session;

"6. Endorses the view of the Population Commission⁵ that the United Nations should encourage and assist the Governments, especially of the less developed countries, in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies of the demographic aspects, as well as other aspects, of their economic and social development problems;

"7. Recommends that the second World Population Conference pay special attention to the interrelationships of population growth with economic and social development, particularly in countries that are less developed, and that efforts be made to obtain the fullest possible participation in the Conference by experts from such countries."

TENNESSEE RIVER BASIN WATER POLLUTION

Mr. GORE, Mr. President, Hon. Frank G. Clement, Governor of Tennes-

⁴ U.N. doc. E/3613.

⁵ U.N. doc. E/3451, paragraph 15.

² U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.709/Rev. 2.

see, delivered a very able address in Nashville, Tenn., on March 4, 1963, on the occasion of the meeting of the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Compact. The Governor spoke of the problems arising from the pollution of our streams. His able analysis and treatment of the subject is of sufficient significance that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that many more people may read his remarks.

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

REMARKS OF GOV. FRANK G. CLEMENT

It is my privilege and pleasure as Governor of the host State to extend greetings and a warm welcome to the distinguished representatives of our sister States who have convened with us here in Nashville for the purpose of organizing and initiating the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Commission.

Within our time the Tennessee River has become known throughout the world if for no other reason as the river which is the scene of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

With the control of water in the main channel of the Tennessee and the development of adjacent lands and resources of the basin, changes have taken place which scarcely could have been imagined 25 or 30 years ago.

The magnitude of these changes almost tax the ability to comprehend. Freight movements on the Tennessee rose from 32 million ton-miles in 1933 to nearly 2½ billion ton-miles per year at the present time.

Private investment in Tennessee River waterfront industrial plants and terminals has amounted to about \$875 million since 1933.

These factors contributed to the rise in personal income within the Tennessee Valley region which is today nine times as great as it was in 1933 and the rate of increase has far outdistanced the growth of the Nation in general.

Much or most of this spectacular growth is based, in one way or another, on the waters of the Tennessee and its tributaries.

In the future, economic growth is going to depend to a greater degree, rather than a lesser degree, on the availability of water and the quality of that water.

Almost every branch of manufacturing activity today uses more water than it did a few years or a few decades ago.

Also, as new products and new processes are developed the quality of water necessary to make them successful becomes more important and purification processes necessary to rid the water of pollutants become more expensive and exacting.

While the industrial growth was taking place along the Tennessee still other things were happening involving a great many people and the public interest generally.

The people turned to these manmade lakes and to the controlled-flow streams of the tributaries to enjoy the great new recreation resource.

Today there are 13 State parks located on the lakes of the Tennessee River system.

Supplementing these are 33 county parks and 32 municipal parks.

In less elaborate, more decentralized and convenient locations are 413 public access areas where the people without cost or obstacle can have access to the lakes, may launch their boats, spread their picnic lunches, and enjoy the waterfront.

In addition, there are wildlife refuges, national parks, national forests, many camps and clubs located on the lakes and literally thousands of residences bearing some relation to the lakes.

The investment in recreation facilities along the shore of the lakes on the Tennessee and its tributaries now represents approximately \$150 million.

The use of the recreation facilities has grown tremendously—presently representing 50-million visitor-days a year and if the waters remain usable, this visitation may double or triple in the next 10 or 15 years.

Perhaps I should emphasize what I have just said—"if the waters remain usable."

We have no desire to see the dead hand of pollution strangle either the industrial or the recreation use of these waters so precious to our several States.

Both uses are needed for the full development of our economy and for the enjoyment of our people.

Both industrial and recreational uses can continue to grow if pollution is controlled and the water is always left in good condition satisfactory for the reasonable use of the next downstream user.

We are happy to announce that during the past 15 years—a period of unprecedented industrial development and urban population growth in Tennessee—we have actually achieved a net reduction in the amount of pollution going into the surface waters of this State.

This means that the people of this State have actually improved the quality of the water leaving Tennessee, near Chattanooga, and flowing into and across northern Alabama and becoming part of the water resources of Alabama and Mississippi.

Similarly, the waters flowing out of Tennessee and across western Kentucky, in Kentucky Lake, are improved or are less hazardous than was the case 15 years ago.

It is our intention that this process shall continue and it is our determination that our actions and pollution arising in this State will not contaminate and render unusable the waters which we are exporting in our streams to our neighboring States.

But we cannot do the job alone. We are conscious of the sovereignty of the State of Tennessee.

In such a posture we can do no other than respect the sovereignty of other States.

We cannot, and we do not wish to, exercise controls within the boundaries of other States.

However, water obeys the law of gravity and flows downhill without regard to State lines and the territories of the several States.

If we at some future date poured hurtful pollution onto our neighboring States they, under present circumstances, would have scant hope of relief except through appeal to the Federal Government for assistance.

This course of action we do not relish, for this inevitably undermines the sovereignty and the responsibility of the several States and yields to the central government still another area of responsibility which it is not necessary that we yield.

The way is still open for cooperation among the seven States represented in the Tennessee watershed.

This program of cooperation can be effectively and predictably carried out through the channels of an interstate compact.

Beginning almost 10 years ago, the then Governors of these seven States appointed delegates to meet together and to work out the draft of a mutually acceptable and thoroughly workable interstate compact. Tennessee was proud to ratify that compact in 1955, thus, placing this State on record as ready to engage responsibly in a joint effort with neighboring States in controlling pollution in the Tennessee and its tributaries.

As their respective legislatures met Mississippi and Kentucky added their ratification actions.

The consent of Congress was given in Public Law 85-734.

We are now assembled to organize the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Commission which will be made up of the

appropriate delegation of three members from each of the ratified States selected in the manner prescribed in each State by its act of ratification.

We are pleased that representatives of other eligible States are present on this occasion so that they may add their voices in an advisory capacity and thus help in launching a course of action in which they have confidence and will, we hope, soon participate officially.

We recognize that there have been legal or procedural obstacles in the way of ratification by some of the eligible States, at least until recently.

We trust that these have been or will be overcome and we look forward to early ratification by all of the States and anticipate a truly joint regional effort in this great undertaking.

OIL STACKS PRESIDENTIAL SURVEY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I intend to speak on the actions of some of the leading administrators in the Federal Government relating to the oil industry. Before I start, I wish to make it clear that I have the greatest respect and admiration for those in the oil industry. They have made a contribution to our society and Nation—a contribution in terms of our economy, employment, and standard of living. In no sense should the remarks that I make be deemed as critical of the hundreds of thousands of fine people in that great and important industry.

At the same time, I think it is appropriate to place the subject in context and point out that there is no industry which has greater political power, greater influence and, at times, dominating influence than the oil industry has.

Perhaps most conspicuous and most frequently discussed is the tax power the industry has and the tax favoritism which it enjoys. Of course, the industry does develop and exploit a national resource. Much of that resource is on federally owned land. Some of it is on State land. In addition, the industry has vast international influence. In the past some distinguished Senators have pointed out that in at least one administration, and I suspect in many, whenever the oil industry caught cold, the administration sneezed.

The oil industry has a great influence throughout America in education, with newspapers, and with many service organizations of various kinds.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR OIL PUBLIC RELATIONS

The API, an important trade organization in the industry, has estimated that the industry has spent about \$50 million a year in public relations. The industry influences the Government in many ways. One is through political contributions. In my own State of Wisconsin, I doubt if we produce a gallon of oil. Yet it is usual for candidates for Federal office, at least, to show contributions from leading figures in the oil industry from Texas, California, and many other States.

Few people realize that this is such a vast and profitable industry that its members actually operate—or at least did in 1953, the most recent year for which figures are available—more aircraft than all the airlines do. They use

the aircraft in many ways. For example, in the State which I represent, aircraft are used to transport political figures. It is a very flattering gesture and service on the part of members of that industry.

Usually the oil industry gets what it wants; and, in the judgment of many people, sometimes what oil wants is not in the public interest.

OIL NAMES GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS

The fundamental way in which the oil industry has achieved its aims is not merely through getting the legislators it wants—although it is quite successful in that regard—but in influencing appointments to top policymaking positions in our Government.

One conspicuous recent example is that of a very able and distinguished man who is now Governor of a great State. John Connally was appointed Secretary of the Navy at a time when he was executor of one of the largest private oil estates in the world. Of course, the Navy buys all the oil for all the armed services. That position is a position of great influence and benefit for the oil industry.

Another example was the appointment of Lawrence O'Connor, confirmation of which I also opposed. Mr. O'Connor spent his lifetime in the oil industry and was the first oil lobbyist in history appointed to the Federal Power Commission, which, of course, has great power and influence over the kind of prices the oil industry can charge.

One appointment which I felt particularly strong about and protested vigorously on the floor of the Senate was that of John M. Kelly. It is about John Kelly that I wish to speak briefly today. John Kelly was appointed 2 years ago as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Minerals. In that capacity he supervises the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the Oil Import Administration, the Office of Mineral Exploration, the Office of Oil and Gas, and the Office of Geography.

Also in this connection I want to discuss the policies and actions of Jerome O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien was appointed the head of the Office of Oil and Gas. In this capacity he does the following:

He provides staff advice and assistance to the Assistant Secretary in the development, coordination, and management of oil and gas programs and functions which are assigned to the Department by the President or by the Congress.

Secondly, Mr. O'Brien provides leadership in obtaining coordination and unification of oil and gas policies and related administrative activities of all Federal agencies, and he enlists their cooperation to assure adequate development, distribution, and utilization of petroleum and gas resources and facilities to meet civilian, industrial, and military requirements in time of peace or national emergency.

In the third place, Mr. O'Brien serves as the principal channel of communication between the Federal Government and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, State regulatory bodies, and the petroleum and gas industries.

Both Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Kelly have long, long records—virtually lifetime records—in the oil industry.

PRO-OIL FIX

What I should like to discuss this afternoon is the action on the part of Mr. Kelly and Mr. O'Brien which I would term to be action to perpetrate a "pro-oil fix" of a Presidentially requested oil survey. I refer to the Interior Department's representation on a study to be made jointly with the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which is made up of representatives of oil-producing States.

Secretary Kelly held millions of dollars worth of oil properties, at the time of his appointment and even after he was appointed to his position to be a public referee over the Nation's oil and gas programs.

This statement was contested yesterday, apparently by those associated with Mr. Kelly, and the Washington Post this morning indicated that Mr. Kelly had disposed of his oil holdings. This was an issue which came up at the time Mr. Kelly was appointed. I discussed that on the floor at the time, and I pointed out that the disposition of the oil holdings by Mr. Kelly was not as it might seem.

In his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, before appointment, Mr. Kelly said:

I will sell all my stockholdings in oil and mining companies.

In regard to any Federal leases, wells on Federal lands, overrides and payments, I will set up a trust and transfer all such interests to a trustee who will sell all such interests. Any such interests which the trustee has been unable to sell he will convey to the Elk Oil Co.

I will resign as president of the Elk Oil Co. and make an irrevocable gift to my minor children of all the stock that I own in this company pursuant to the Gift to Minors Act of New Mexico.

I intend to maintain my current operations on State and fee lands.

It was on the basis of this statement that members of the committee seemed to conclude that Mr. Kelly had disposed of his oil holdings and that there was no conflict of interest. Technically, there was none. Technically, Mr. Kelly complied with the law. He complied with the precise requirements in the law. He disposed of his holdings of properties and interests on Federal lands.

Of course, in his position as Assistant Secretary of the Interior, he would have direct jurisdiction over the Federal lands.

What he held on to is quite interesting. Later in his testimony before the committee he said:

Senator, I do not believe that I will continue to operate my properties. I do not intend to continue to operate my properties. I will hold ownership of them. But the actual operations would be carried on by other people.

He also said:

I am divesting myself of probably 50 percent or better of my properties in order to place myself in the position in which I feel that I can assume the duties of my office with complete impartiality toward the deci-

sions that I might make as Assistant Secretary. As you understand, I operate as an individual—

And so forth.

Mr. President, if Mr. Kelly was disposing of 50 percent of his holdings, and they were described in the hearings as being very great, for Mr. Kelly held millions of dollars worth of property—he was obviously holding on to 50 percent of his holdings, or nearly 50 percent of his holdings. He still owns oil land. He still has an interest in the oil industry amounting to millions of dollars.

While this may not be a direct and immediate legal conflict, I submit the fact is that he is still involved, or that he was at the time of his nomination. There has been no evidence whatsoever that, after making the statement to the committee, he subsequently divested himself of any of his holdings. It seems he is still involved in substantial oil holdings.

Mr. President, Mr. Jerome O'Brien, who became Kelly's prime assistant on oil matters, came to the job from the vice presidency of the Humble Oil Co. and a lifetime in the oil industry. I feel now—as I felt at the time that these appointments of pro-oil men were made—that they put the American consumer at a gross disadvantage.

HOW OIL INDUSTRY IS "CASHING IN"

Now the oil industry is really cashing in. The most powerful special interest group in Government—the oil crowd—is making sure that the findings of this oil survey, which is an oil survey requested by the President of the United States, will be in its interest.

In a memorandum written by Allen Calvert, Jr., a member of the Interstate Compact Commission, reporting on a conversation with Secretary Kelly and O'Brien, it is clear that this oil duo is intent on confining the Interior Department's representation in the oil survey largely to themselves.

In addition, Secretary Kelly would load the Compact Commission—which is supposed to be making the investigation—with men like Texas Gov. John Connally, described by Secretary Kelly as "primarily from the oil industry." He is indeed. In fact, he is executor of one of the largest private oil estates in the world. He gets a very large proportion of his income—almost all of his income—from this estate.

The Calvert memo reveals the arrogant contempt Secretary Kelly feels toward the Interior Department career officials not connected with the oil industry. Secretary Kelly characterizes these officials as "Red-Hot Bureaucrats."

Why? Because, as might be expected, they have a far different view of Federal responsibility toward the oil industry from that of Secretary Kelly or Mr. O'Brien.

Secretary Kelly's conduct should be a supreme example to the Senate of the vital importance of insisting on an absence of conflict of interest as a prime prerequisite in approving Presidential nominations.

Mr. President, I wish to read and discuss the memorandum which brought to

the attention of the country the plans and programs of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for the oil industry.

THE CALVERT MEMORANDUM

This is a memorandum written by Mr. Allen Calvert, Jr., the Oklahoma representative on the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. These are Mr. Calvert's notes of the conference with Assistant Secretary John Kelly and Jerome O'Brien in their offices in Washington on February 12—in other words, notes concerning his conversation with the two men in the top policy positions in our Government dealing with the oil industry.

This memorandum has been published in the "Oil Daily." The memorandum has been attacked. To some extent it has been disowned. But I think that the frankness and straightforwardness of this memorandum speaks for itself.

Without implying any hidden, ulterior motives or Machiavellian attitudes on the part of anyone, it seems to me it is very difficult to read this memorandum, which has been published, without recognizing what Mr. Kelly and Mr. O'Brien are up to.

The memorandum is a brief memorandum, and I will read the text of it:

On this date Lawrence Alley, executive secretary of Interstate Compact, and I called upon Messrs. Kelly and O'Brien as a follow-up to a request made by Governor Welsh, chairman of the Interstate Compact, at the executive committee meeting held Monday, February 4, in Oklahoma City.

Governor Welsh had taken note of John Kelly's inability to meet with the compact on that date and had designated Mr. Alley and myself to determine the subject matter that had caused Mr. Kelly to make the appointment in the first place.

Mr. Kelly commenced our interview with the statement that a year-end cabinet report or summary of various departments' activities had been presented to the President and that as a result thereof a directive from the President had been given to Mr. Kelly to implement a study of Federal-State relations as they pertained to oil and gas production and related matters.

In other words, this was a directive from the President, a Presidential request and directed survey.

Reading from the memorandum:

Mr. Kelly further amplified the objectives as being an interest of his Department, of the President, and of the Government in making domestic oil as competitive as it possibly could be with foreign oil. He offered as one of the reasons from which the directive resulted the explanation that the domestic producers had gone to the Government for foreign import controls and that for that reason and others certain elements of the Government took the position and believed that they should know more as to what the various States were doing to bring uniformity to regulations, assure conservation, complying with the Connally hot oil act, etc. Mr. Kelly used, I believe, the term that there were some "red hot bureaucrats," chiefly career people, who had nurtured the idea—as we have always known—that the domestic production of oil and gas should be federally controlled or at least more than it is now.

Mr. Kelly stressed that it was his intense desire to present these thoughts to the proper officials of the compact with as full an explanation as possible and with every

precaution being taken so as not to cause alarm. He indicated that if a working group were jointly established that he thought that it should be small as to both sides and he inferred that he and Jerry O'Brien, his chief assistant, and other top level people in the Interior, if necessary—as opposed to career men—would represent their half of the group.

In other words, the position taken by Mr. Kelly at the conference was that the representation of the Interior Department should be primarily by himself, as one who had been in the oil industry all his life, who has heavy investments in the oil industry, and Mr. O'Brien, who was formerly with the Humble Oil Co., and a man who also had an oil industry viewpoint. The memorandum continues:

After some discussion, Mr. Alley and I told them that we would report our conversation to Governor Welsh on the presumption that the matter would then be referred to members of the compact's executive committee for further consideration. In our discussion it was mutually assumed that Gov. Jack Campbell might have the most continuous cognizance and knowledge of activities which might be covered by such a study (rather than an investigation), however, Gov. John Connally also might have such knowledge, they both being primarily from the oil industry. Secretary Kelly stressed that he was not a hurry-up or haste-makes-waste man and that while he was under the stern directive to get started, he did not want the beginning to be of a character that would alarm people. He stated that he would await word from Governor Welsh and that some time after the first of March he would be available at the convenience of Governor Welsh either to visit him at Indianapolis or to confer with him in Washington preliminary to setting up the working group. He assumed that Governor Welsh would wish to process the suggestion with various parties to the compact and repeated that we should take all time necessary to do so. Mr. Alley and I did not compare our immediate reactions to the conference inasmuch as we both had traveling or other appointments, but Mr. Alley did comment to me that the conference results and purposes were much more important than he had assumed and despite his long background with the compact, I believe he was considerably surprised.

Before I read the last paragraph of the memorandum, let me say it is surprising that these gentlemen should be so concerned about the study of the Compact Commission. It is surprising that they felt that somehow, some way, it might be a threat to the oil industry; that if the so-called bureaucrats who had no financial interest in the oil industry, who were appointed for the public interest, and who had no ax to grind, were represented on the Commission, and it was viewed as an investigation commission, the oil industry might be in for some trouble. How sensitive Mr. Kelly is about what the Oil Compact Commission does; how it contributes to the economic advantage and profits of the oil industry; how, conversely, it might lead to higher prices for the consumer and, in the lack of competition, into a monopoly position, is disclosed in the second paragraph. I am again reading from the memorandum:

Secretary Kelly, in referring to the bureaucrats, mentioned the fact that the Department of Justice had had many very critical reports of the compact and he further stated

that an individual who represented the Department at the last executive committee meeting was one of those who was critical of the compact and would like more Federal intervention. This point is obviously pertinent and important in view of the necessity of renewing the compact's life every 4 years, such renewal being considered at this time by a bill introduced by U.S. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON.

Mr. President, let us take a look at the compact and what the compact amounted to, what it did, what its responsibility has been, and what its influence has been.

What I have done is secure these reports from the Attorney General's office. I called the Attorney General's office and secured every report on the compact commission made by the Attorney General.

Before I discuss these reports, however, I want to read from an excellent book by Robert Engler in which he discusses the commission. Engler, frankly, has been a critic of the oil industry, but a scholarly critic. He has said this in his book:

Nominally an organization of State officials, the commission is under the constant surveillance of the oil companies who have always recognized it as an instrument for forestalling Federal regulation. In past years oil companies have flown State members to the meetings, and the natural gas industry has footed banquet bills. The technique is more sophisticated today, although as usual the industry's vast private airplane fleet remains one of the significant ways the industry has for flattering and serving modestly paid political and administrative personnel at all levels.

SENATOR WHERRY'S CHARGES OF PRICE FIXING

Mr. President, when this commission was in its early operation, a distinguished Senator, now deceased, and a very conservative man, a man who was a great friend of American business and free enterprise, Kenneth Wherry, discussed the way the Commission operates and the way the oil industry operates, in very telling language, which I shall quote from briefly.

First, Mr. Engler said in his book:

Potential oil States are fitted into this system by conservation (market demand) laws introduced even before oil is found. After the late Senator Kenneth Wherry, Republican, of Nebraska, never noted for his hostility to business investigated this entire operation, he suggested that the President should suspend the Connally Act because of its use to create shortage and maintain price. Concluded his Small Business Committee: "There is a mechanism controlling the production of crude oil to market demand that operates as smoothly as the finest watch."

Currently much of big oil favors the use of State power to force recalcitrant producers to cooperate in the joint operation of fields. This has merit as a conservation measure.

It also reveals oil's willingness to use Government coercion when convenient, raising intriguing questions as to the industry's presumed commitment to the competitive system. (In the early thirties, the head of Standard of New Jersey even proposed that the Government operate the flowing east Texas fields on a unitized basis.)

The industry is always careful to supply appropriate agencies of the Federal Government with a steady stream of temporary suitable personnel.

ATTORNEY GENERAL IN 4-YEAR DEFAULT ON REPORT

When I talked to the Justice Department they gave me very shocking information this morning. They said that the Attorney General has been in default of the law for 4 years in failing to meet the requirement of annual reports of the interstate compact. In other words, since 1959 the Attorney General has not filed a single report, although the law requires him to file a report each year. The resolution as adopted in 1959 clearly required this annual report.

I asked the Justice Department why it had not complied with the law. The Justice Department, far from being critical of the oil compact or having an ax to grind said that the Department is in default because it is the feeling of the Department of Justice that the Compact Commission has not been an instrument of monopoly or price fixing; that, there is monopoly resulting from the power of, a few dominant companies which enjoy a vertically integrated domination, including pipeline control. This gives them the ability to fix prices.

They tell me that the reports were discontinued when Robert Bicks was head of the division. That was in the Eisenhower administration under Attorney General Rogers. No one has been on it since, and the reports have never been resumed.

Anyone who feels that these reports of the Attorney General might have been critical can get some idea of Mr. Kelly's ideas of criticism by considering a few excerpts from these reports. The very first report by the Attorney General said this:

The ultimate purpose for which the report requirement was enacted seems clear: To provide the Congress with an informed judgment by the Attorney General on the competitive effects of the system by which oil production is regulated.

That article of the compact states:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

In this article, the interstate agreement sets forth clearly the " * * * purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the physical waste thereof."

Article V also undeniably embraces the additional purpose of opposing price stabilization or monopolization, although this purpose is stated indirectly by the express withholding of authority under the compact to achieve such ends.

Mr. President, Congress set this up because Congress was concerned with the very real possibility that in the guise of conservation and preventing improper exploitation, the compact commission might act to fix prices and raise profits of the oil industry and to penalize, of course, the consuming public.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator does recognize, does he not, that there is a real problem in the petroleum industry, in that production should not become in surplus to the extent that it exceeds the amount of aboveground storage for the production? After all, the oil is located in underground reservoirs, in the first instance. It will stay there for a thousand years or longer. If we take it above ground, it will evaporate, or, if we do not have enough storage facilities, there is no alternative but to have it in overflow tanks, and in that way eventually contaminate the streams.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I think it is absolutely right that with this kind of resource it is necessary to have some kind of regulation of production, the kind that Texas has, and the kind, I presume, that Louisiana has.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Louisiana has much better regulation than Texas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know that in Texas they regulate the oil flow so that at the present time they are pumping about 8 or 9 days a month, or have that amount of production.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Unfortunately, in Texas the production of oil is regulated by the railroad commissioners, and they, in turn, must run for office. Therefore in Texas a great number of wells, particularly the older wells—and I would hope not their better wells, but a great number of the wells—are not under any regulation at all, and they can produce as much as they can pump out.

In Louisiana every producing well is under control. It is only by control and prorating how much each producer can bring to the surface that any equitable way can be arranged so that the production will not completely exceed the market for the problem; not only exceed it, but greatly exceed the amount of storage available above ground.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is making my point very well. He is right; there has to be that kind of regulation. There has to be Government regulation. What I am saying is that this regulation should be dispassionate, objective regulation, in the public interest. It should not be guided primarily by people with a vested interest in the oil industry, or people who are motivated by their own holdings in the oil industry, and obviously are suspect of having an interest in maximizing profits in the oil industry, which might contradict the interest of the consumers and of all the citizens, who want to preserve a great resource.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The regulation in Louisiana is by the conservation commissioner. So far as I know, the conservation commissioner has no interest in oil production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure he does not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that State law may require that he should not have an interest in oil production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it should.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Generally speaking, however, these conservation commissioners in Louisiana have tend-

ed to favor the small producer as against the interest of the large producer. They have tended to favor the fellow who has a small well that might be able to produce only 8 or 10 barrels a day as against the larger wells, owned by large companies, that could produce, perhaps, 500 barrels a day without pumping.

As it is, Louisiana is entitled to about 10 percent of the market. I would imagine that Louisiana would produce a great deal more than that if we were permitted to produce to capacity. The difficulty is that it is completely within the capacity of the oil producers of Louisiana and of other States to greatly exceed the demands for the product in the country. Therefore, about the only way to pace production, so that it does not exceed the capacity to use and store, particularly above ground, is to regulate the rate at which it is produced.

I cannot see that there is any special interest involved here in working out some system in each State under which each State would undertake to keep its production at a certain percentage of its capacity to produce. I know of no other way it could be worked out, unless the Federal Government wanted to step into the field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And unless the Federal Government wanted to regulate a great many things which more logically is a local function.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe, as I continue, the Senator from Louisiana will see that the argument which I am making is not that such an arrangement is unnecessary or undesirable; but that this kind of regulation does involve some very serious problems as far as the oil consumer is concerned, and that the administration should be objective and should not be colored by those who have a vested interest in protecting only the private oil industry.

The industry needs protection, and very careful consideration. It should be protected. It is a vital industry. What I am trying to say is that that is exactly what the Attorney General did in a very dispassionate way. I think the Attorney General should be criticized for not having lived up to the letter of the law or for not coming to Congress and asking for relief, or for not filing a report, or not filing at least a pro forma report. He files no report at all.

As I proceed, the Senator will see how carefully the Attorney General approached this. I am not talking about the present Attorney General, but about the Attorney General in the Eisenhower administration. I am pointing out how carefully he approached this matter to make sure that no one would be harmed and no prejudice would result against the oil industry or against anyone in the oil industry. In the light of all this, criticism by Mr. Kelly of the Attorney General as being too zealous and too much interested in Government regulation, is, to me, very shocking.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has made some reference to the fact that a number of oil companies possess airplanes. Of course, he is correct in

that statement. The oil industry does possess a large number of airplanes. I hope he will keep in mind that in many instances these planes are essential in the conduct of the oil industry's business.

I have in mind one company, for example, which is more in the construction of pipelines, than it is in the production of oil. They try to train each of their foremen to go to his job flying a little amphibious airplane. It is much cheaper to have the man at home at night and then fly a small airplane which can land on a lagoon or lake or canal in Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about it. The Senator is making an excellent correction of what I have said.

I think it is essential in the industry. It is a very useful tool which the industry employs for its technical work and exploration.

The point I wish to make and emphasize is that this is a vast, powerful, rich industry. I think the point is dramatized when we consider that it has more planes than all the airlines combined. I am sure that the planes are used overwhelmingly for immediate business purposes. But the fact is that they are also used to assist politicians. I have seen that practice followed in my State, and I know it is followed elsewhere.

This industry has an enormous interest in securing the right kind of representation in Washington, not only from the oil-producing States, but also from the nonoil-producing States. This is one of the instruments which it uses to assist, and I have called attention to it in passing. But certainly the Senator from Louisiana is correct in stating that that is not the main reason for maintaining so large a fleet of airplanes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The great majority of the planes to which the Senator is referring are small, light aircraft. Of course, there is a substantial number of executive planes; but I believe that most of the planes to which the Senator is referring are small light aircraft, designed to fly into hard-to-reach places, such as some of the locations in Louisiana which the planes reach on pontoons, where there is no road available to reach the place at all.

One of the big aircraft, such as a jet plane, probably costs more than the price of two or three hundred of the kinds of planes to which the Senator is, in part, referring. I am sure the Senator realizes that the great majority of the planes are very small ones.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the first report of the Attorney General, issued under the 1955 resolution:

To read the words of the joint resolution at face value, with no regard to the long history of Congressional concern, would seem to limit inquiry to the conservation activity directly authorized and carried out " * * * under the provisions of the compact * * *," thereby apparently excluding any consideration of price stabilization or monopolization. Those problems, however, have been the Congress' chief concern.

The purpose of the statute, as disclosed in the legislative history, is to secure a con-

sideration by the Attorney General of the ultimate effect on the industry of the whole regulatory operation, in which the States, the Compact, and the Federal Government all play a part. The relevant legislative history includes not only consideration of this particular provision by Congress. It includes, as well, the long history of the part which the Congress has played in conservation of oil and gas, and the concern it has long displayed over the effects of conservation measures on competition in the petroleum industry.

The report goes on to say:

When the compact was brought before the Congress for renewal in 1955, the Senate amended the consenting resolution. The amendment required an annual report by the Attorney General whether the activities of the States had "remained within the purpose of such compact," and whether such activities had " * * * resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation of perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production of oil or gas * * *." Before the House committee, certain objections to the report requirement were raised on behalf of the Attorney General. The committee recommended that the report provision be amended into its present form, and the proposed amendment was adopted.

Further, the report states:

Accommodating these considerations to the language of the statute, I conclude that the report requirement directs (1) an examination of the petroleum industry to determine if it evidences the existence of anticompetitive practices, including monopolization and price stabilization, and (2) a determination whether any such practices result from this regulatory system. This would, in my opinion, meet the primary concern of the Congress without requiring any investigation or determination of the motives or purposes of the actions of State agencies.

This consideration of the "results" of the operation of the regulatory system on industry practices finds support in the legislative history of the report requirement. As the provision was first added in the Senate, it required a report on whether the activities related to the compact "have resulted" in price fixing, monopoly or regimentation, a clear direction to consider the industrial results, and not the object or motive of State action.

Then, I read one more brief excerpt:

Accordingly, it would appear that the statutory requirement for reports calls for an inquiry into the practices and organization of the oil production industry. That inquiry must ascertain whether price-fixing or monopolistic practices have grown around the production limitations adopted for conservation purposes, regardless of whether or not such practices involve a violation of present law, or are an intended or an accidental result of the regulatory system. Only on the basis of such an inquiry can an informed conclusion be made as to the competitive effect of the pattern of regulatory action.

That was the purpose of this investigation by the Attorney General, required by Congress, and very carefully handled by the Attorney General to make certain that there was no prejudice against the oil industry, or particularly the Compact Commission, made by representatives of the oil-producing States.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CONCLUDES MONOPOLY, BUT NOT BY COMPACT

In the last report, the conclusion is generally favorable to the oil compact.

It is not completely favorable to the industry; it is critical to some extent, but in a very mild way. I read from page 61 of the fourth report of the Attorney General:

Analysis of crude oil prices shows a stability coincident with the beginnings of conservation.

This was the conclusion after 4 years of analysis.

But stabilization of supply was the necessary and intended result of the Federal action approving and implementing State prorationing under the Connally "Hot Oil" Act. With that aid and approval, State prorationing operated to curtail the amount of excess oil available to disturb the market by wide local or national price swings. At the same time, price history shows that the price responded to economic pressures, both upward and downward, before the war. Thereafter, the record shows crude oil prices rising steadily, rather unrelated to increasing supply or economic changes.

The report concluded that there was an upward bias, an upward trend, in oil prices from World War II on, as the conservation commissions began to work together to control the available supply of oil.

I shall now read from two of the most pertinent additional observations:

For this phenomenon there is little evidence that State action is responsible. State regulatory bodies normally do not collect price data in connection with their determinations on permissible production.

The pipeline system was capable of absorbing temporary local cuts by resort to unregulated sources of supply. No "shortage" of oil created by State action could be held responsible for any price movement. Considering the complex and varying bases of decision faced by each of the State agencies, and the constant pressure of local producers to be allowed the fullest share of production, the task of prorationing to achieve a desired price level would be virtually impossible.

These are the concluding observations by Attorney General William P. Rogers:

A different problem, however, is posed by the present pattern of pipeline ownership and operation. Only one possible pipeline connection is usually available to a well, and, considering its cost, is likely to endure for the life of the well. The economies of size in trunkline operation logically impel building one large diameter line to a field or area, sufficient to carry anticipated production and therefore preclusive of economical operation of other lines.

The position of each pipeline owner is greatly magnified by reciprocal use of pipelines among the select group of integrated companies owning pipelines. Logical and efficient operation of pipelines as a transportation system urges cooperation between lines and avoidance of duplication and cross-hauling. But the pipeline system is more than a transport agency, it is the crude oil market. And cooperative use of pipelines has a grave potential for control of crude oil markets.

Antitrust litigation can perhaps deal with particular cases of pipeline abuse. But the problem is more far-reaching, covering the broad spectrum of this industry's transportation and buying operations, and singularly suited to legislative action. Precise definition of the problem requires compulsory process to insure complete information; and any policy decision on the appropriate solution seems best suited to legislative determination.

Mr. President, in the light of the Attorney General's reports which by law, according to the Attorney General's Office, are still required and are, in fact, in default for 4 years—ever since 1959 there has been no report—in view of the moderation, so far as the conduct of the Commission is concerned, what in the world is Assistant Secretary Kelly afraid of? What are these red-hot bureaucrats or officials in the Department of Justice up to, in view of the fact that these are the only reports which have been made, and no others have been made for 3½ or 4 years.

It seems to me that the memorandum disclosing the position of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior is most significant, because the Assistant Secretary of the Interior and the head of the Office of Oil and Gas take the position that even this kind of mild, hesitant, reluctant inquiry by the Department of Justice is not proper, they do not want it, and they feel that it is likely to prejudice the oil industry.

ARROGANCE OF OIL-ORIENTED OFFICIALS

I think this is an obvious commentary on the enormous influence the oil industry now has in the Department of the Interior, in our administration, with those who are responsible for regulating the oil industry; and I think it is also an obvious commentary on the arrogance of the oil industry and the great need, in my judgment, that we have these reports.

The Department of Justice did indicate that, as of 1959, it concluded that the Interstate Oil Compact Commission was not being used to fix prices—at least, not in a way which the Department of Justice felt was a violation of the antimonopoly laws. However, I can see no reason why there should not be a continuing report to Congress in view of the real temptation for the Commissioners and for the States—in view of their great power and in view of the authority the Federal Government has given them—to fix the flow of oil from the oilfields, as the Senator from Louisiana has set forth so well.

We have a responsibility to the consumers of the country to make sure that this enormous power over the most profitable industry in the United States is not used to exploit the consumers. The fact that we have not had a single report—and that this is in violation of the law—on this matter from the Office of the Attorney General in 4 years indicates to me how urgently we need more concern for the consumers.

SENATE SHOULD INSIST ON REPORTS

I would think that at the time when the life of the Compact Commission comes up for renewal, this year, in connection with the joint resolution which I understand the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has introduced, and which will come before Congress this year, Congress should give very careful consideration to insisting on obtaining a regular report from the Department of Justice on the possibilities of using the Compact Commission as a means of fixing prices, establishing prices, and pushing prices up. The Attorney General did conclude that prices have been moving one way, since 1946, and that is up.

VITAL IMPORTANCE OF CONFIRMING OFFICIALS FREE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. President, I should like to conclude this part of my presentation this afternoon by saying that I think all Senators should be aware of what this revelation really means. We confirmed the nomination of John M. Kelly as Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of minerals—the top policy position in regard to oil—with full knowledge not only that Mr. Kelly had spent a lifetime in the oil industry, but also that he had millions of dollars of interest in State and private oil lands and that he said he would hold on to them, and also—as I have said—Mr. Jerome O'Brien, the head of the office of oil and gas—spent a lifetime in the oil industry, most recently in the Humble Oil Co., as vice president.

If we are to have a detached attitude in the public interest on the part of high-policy officials—indeed, I think we should on their part have a zealous attitude in the public interest—obviously we should not have in the top position, with the duty of representing the public viewpoint, one whose interest obviously is very often against the public interest and in his own personal interest.

DEFICIT SPENDING NO SOLUTION TO LAGGING ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, throughout the country the President of the United States has been criticized—and our mail indicates it very plainly—for being irresponsible in regard to the proposed budget and the deficit. Although I disagree with the President in this area, I think the attention of the Senate and the attention of the country should be called to the fact that the President is much more conservative in this respect than are many of his critics and many businessmen. In fact, a majority of the Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee, excluding this Senator, asked for a larger deficit, and all of the Republican members did likewise. Republicans asked for a slight cutback in spending; but the cutback they proposed adds up—according to the spokesman for the minority members, Representative CURTIS, of Missouri—to a larger deficit than the one which would result from the budget the President has proposed for 1964. I think the people of the country should realize this fact. I have been one who has criticized the President for his tax-cut proposal; but, Mr. President, after all, we find that on the Joint Economic Committee, which is supposed to be the chief congressional committee on economic policy, the minority members, as well as the majority members, argue that the President has proposed too small a deficit, not too large a deficit.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin has analyzed the proposal of the Governor of New York in this regard, as to how it would compare.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have not precisely analyzed the proposals of the Governor of New York. It is true that he advocated a reduction of spending. However, I do believe that his proposal comes very close to the position taken by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee. The difficulty with the position of the Governor of New York is that he does not specify how much the cut in spending should be. He does not indicate what spending should be cut. He uses the term "low priority programs." Of course, everyone is against "low priority programs." But there is no specification. The Governor has asked for a bigger tax cut than has President Kennedy. I am talking about the proposed tax cut the first year, the tax cut which would affect the coming budget. He has asked for a bigger tax cut, and unless he can do a better job of suggesting ways to reduce spending than he has done in New York State, or than his Republican colleagues have done in the Congress of the United States—the House or the Senate—he will end with a bigger deficit than President Kennedy has.

Mr. President, one of the outstanding businessmen-statesman in our country is the distinguished Frazer Wilde, who is chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. He was head of the Commission on Money and Credit appointed by President Kennedy, I believe—a very able, fine, and distinguished man. But Mr. Wilde, who speaks with great ability, perspicacity, and knowledge of finance, and as a spokesman of the financial community, also has asked for a far bigger tax cut, and what would amount to a much bigger deficit, the first year at least, than President Kennedy has asked for.

I make that statement in preface to remarks I should like to make in criticizing the proposal for a tax cut and a proposal for increasing our deficit.

MAJORITY RIGHT ON MONETARY POLICY—WRONG ON TAX POLICY

I was the one Democratic member of the Joint Economic Committee who filed individual views dissenting from the majority report. I wish to make clear that I support the majority of the committee on monetary policy. I consider it the finest statement of Government policy in the monetary field that I have read for a long time. It is brilliant. It is absolutely correct. I earnestly hope that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Reserve Board, who establish our monetary policy, will read the report with the greatest of care. It is based upon the best monetary advice the Joint Economic Committee could get.

THE CASE AGAINST A TAX CUT NOW

Mr. President, I should like to discuss now the case against a tax cut.

OVERWHELMING DRIVE FOR TAX CUT

All Americans, of course, desire relief from the heavy burden of taxes they must bear to support our Government.

A tax cut now is powerfully supported by the President, leading business organizations, top labor groups, a heavy consensus of economists, and many of the most influential opinion-leading commentators.

TAX CUT NOT RESPONSIBLE

But I submit that tax reduction under the following conditions is not responsible in a period of relative prosperity in the economy:

First. The current deficit is expected to approach \$9 billion.

Second. The administration plans to ask for an initial increase in spending of about \$4.5 billion. Based on past experience, Congress is more likely to increase than to decrease the President's initial spending proposals.

Third. The national debt exceeds \$300 billion. It is greater than the national debt of all other nations in the world combined. Service costs on the debt are already \$10 billion.

Fourth. The tax cut would increase the size of the deficit, the national debt, and the burden of servicing the debt.

TAX CUT SURE TO INCREASE DEFICIT AND NATIONAL DEBT

The easy assumption has been made by many administration witnesses that the tax cut, far from deepening the deficit, eventually would reduce it and, in fact, is the surest way to a balanced budget.

This is almost certainly wrong.

Calculations based on the whole sweep of witnesses appearing before the committee show that the longrun net loss of revenues flowing from the \$10 billion tax cut would be between \$1 and \$6½ billion.

The most typical assumptions on the multiplier effect of the tax cut by witnesses before the committee were that it would be between 2 and 2½. In other words, that a \$10 billion tax cut would increase the gross national product by \$20 to \$25 billion.

The consensus was clear that monetary restraint of the kind the Nation's money managers told the committee they expected to practice would reduce this multiplier. One monetary expert estimated that such a monetary policy would probably result in a multiplier of 1½, or a \$15 billion increase in the gross national product from a \$10 billion tax cut. All things considered, a multiplier of 2 or a \$20 billion gross national product increase from a \$10 billion tax cut would seem to be as reasonable a guess as any.

What would such an increase in the gross national product flowing from such a tax cut mean to ultimate Federal revenues?

Here again the expert witnesses differed. Dr. Arthur Burns, of Columbia University, and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, estimated it would be about one-sixth. His estimate is confirmed by relating Federal tax revenues to the size of the gross national product. The relationship is about one-sixth.

On the basis of such an estimate, the net loss from a \$10 billion tax cut allowing for a \$3½ billion increase in revenues would be \$6½ billion.

On the other hand the Council of Economic Advisers testified that the Federal tax recovery from increased gross national product is 30 percent. Even on this cheery basis, Government revenues would increase only \$6 billion as a result

of the \$10 billion tax cut and the net loss would be \$4 billion.

Even if we take the most optimistic multiplier assumptions of the Council: that the multiplier is 3 and that a \$10 billion tax cut will increase the gross national product by \$30 billion, and apply the optimistic Council 30-percent figure for Federal tax recovery, the total recovery of revenues would still be \$9 billion and the net loss would be \$1 billion. The Council has suggested that the multiplier may be somewhat higher than 2 because of induced investment through the so-called accelerator principle. They have, however, wisely refrained from estimating the quantity of this additional amount since, with the present high levels of excess capacity, it seems doubtful that any additional investment will be encouraged by the tax reduction.

The conclusion that the kind of sharp across-the-board tax reduction recommended by the President would result in an eventual as well as an immediate tax loss is borne out by economic analysis as well as by commonsense.

ADMINISTRATION RELIES ON STIMULATION FROM DEFICIT

Argument by administration witnesses for a tax cut has been made primarily on the grounds that it would increase demand in the economy, and that with unemployment close to 6 percent and plant utilization at 82 percent, the economy needs a surging demand.

Indeed, most administration witnesses frankly see little difference in economic impact between a reduction in Federal taxes and an increase in Federal spending. Both, in their view, would increase demand. Both would do so by increasing the Federal deficit.

The theoretical result: As the deficit increases, the Government puts more into the economy in demand—spending—than it takes out in taxing.

DEFICITS HAVE NOT BROUGHT SOUND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE PAST

Will deficits in fact stimulate sound long-term growth? Our recent history has plenty to say about the answer to this question.

In the past 32 years this Nation has become thoroughly experienced in Federal deficits. Deficits have been a continuous way of life for our National Government almost throughout this period. These deficits have been so immense that the national debt has exploded twentyfold since 1930: from \$16 billion to over \$300 billion.

With this experience, this Nation should be expert on the stimulative effect of deficits on the economy. What has been the result?

Except in World War II when deficits were astronomical, there is no evidence that continuous deficits have promoted economic growth. The evidence is all to the contrary.

The biggest growth in peacetime Federal debt, for example, was in the decade of the 1930's and in the period since 1957. The 1930's period was characterized by disastrous economic stagnation and record unemployment, coinciding with 10 years of such heavy deficits that they would be equivalent to \$20 billion annually today. From 1957 to date, Fed-

eral deficits have averaged a heavy \$6 billion per year. And yet, economic growth has been the slow-moving despair of current economists during this very period.

Advocates of the deficit route point to the impressive economic progress in Europe during the past decade to support the deficit stimulus theory. The economic situation in European countries during the past 10 years is so vastly different from ours—particularly in terms of demand—that the comparison is not a valid one.

But even here what does the record show? The industrial star of Europe, Germany, enjoying a mammoth 92-percent growth in industrial production in the 8 years between 1953 and 1961 (most recent year for which figures are available) compared to 20 percent in this country; but its deficit averaged 0.1 percent of gross national product during this period compared to an average deficit of 0.4 percent of gross national product in the United States. In terms of gross national product, Germany had one-fourth the deficit and four times the growth of this country.

This is not to argue that deficits retard growth. It is to argue that in a \$550 billion economy, even the \$12 billion deficit programed by the administration is swamped by the impact of private economic forces.

DEFICIT FOR GROWTH: A RADICAL DEPARTURE

Until this year, 1963, the President had contended that deficits might be necessary public policy in periods of recession. But on the upturn of the cycle, the Federal Government should run a surplus and over the business cycle balance the budget.

But now we are asked to follow a radically new theory. The deliberate deepening of the deficit this year is not planned for the purpose of overcoming a recession. Indeed, the President talked of 22 months of uninterrupted recovery in his state of the Union message. The planned deficit is billed for the purpose of promoting long-term growth.

But sound long-term growth can no more be based on the deficit gimmick than on any other easy panacea. Growth of an individual, a family, or a nation depends on the hard, long work of many years, on the sacrifices and forbearance required for education, the gradual development of skills, and the painful processes of research.

The preeminent economic success of America has been based squarely on individual self-reliance, with minimum Government participation and maximum individual freedom and incentive. Indeed, the starkest economic difference in the world today is between the economic stagnation of Communist collective economies and the dynamism of free Western economies.

SOUND TAX CUT REQUIRES SPENDING CUT FIRST

All of this suggests that the right prescription should indeed be a tax cut to free the economy's productive force from the burden of Government taxes but unless Federal spending is reduced—at least to keep pace with the reduction

in Federal taxes—the reduced burden is a mirage.

Tax reduction with increased Government spending gives the impression of a lighter Government burden. But the lessened tax burden when spending is increased is then quickly translated into higher prices and an evaporation of the increased purchasing power of the tax cut. The taxpayer's aftertax income may be higher. But his income buys no more.

The sure inflationary impact of a tax cut this year was freely conceded in the hearings by such an eminent authority as Professor Duesenberry of Harvard. No economist disputed it.

SPENDING CAN BE CUT

If a tax cut with increased spending is not the answer, can, as a matter of practical fact, spending be reduced or at least stabilized without sacrificing major goals of this Nation such as national defense, space exploration, and indeed the development of skills through education on which long-term growth must be based?

Can spending be wisely reduced? It can indeed.

Although the President implied that spending other than defense, space, and interest will remain the same in 1964 as in the current fiscal year, the fact is that this spending will increase by more than \$2 billion.

DOMESTIC SPENDING TO CLIMB \$2 BILLION THIS YEAR

This year's budget by various book-keeping transactions conceals the real increase in spending in the domestic sector.

The reason the \$2 billion increase doesn't show up is because the administration plans to sell \$700 million of the cotton surplus, \$423 million of Export-Import Bank holdings, \$315 million of Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Housing Authority mortgages, \$300 million in Commodity Credit Corporation loans, \$150 million in farm housing loans, and \$150 million in college housing loans. This total of \$2 billion of liquidated assets will be used to offset increased spending in almost every department of Government.

GOVERNMENT SALE OF HOME MORTGAGES SURE TO SLOW DOWN RECOVERY

The administration's announced intention of selling \$315 million of Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Housing Authority mortgages during the coming year is sure to tend to drive up interest rates for home buyers.

The Budget Director told the committee at the hearings that the general impact on interest rates would not be significant because in the absence of the sale of mortgages the administration would be required to sell other Federal securities—presumably Treasury securities—to finance the deficit.

But the impact of the sale of such a large amount of mortgages could be quite different from the effect of selling a similar amount of Treasury securities. Interest rates on Treasury securities have only a secondary effect on mortgage rates. Some Government experts have testified to the committee the effect is relatively unimportant.

There can be no question, however, that the sale of more than \$300 million of home mortgages by the Government will have a definite tendency to drive up interest rates.

If interest rates on home mortgages do indeed rise, unemployment would be sure to increase.

The biggest cost in home buying is interest. A rise in mortgage interest rates will surely reduce home construction. Home construction contributes directly and heavily to employment. Any cut-back in home starts would seriously retard economic recovery.

Government sale of \$300 million of mortgages could significantly reduce whatever expansionary effect the tax cut might have on the economy.

BIG INCREASES IN GOVERNMENT PAYROLLS

Let us consider the surest index of expanded spending: The Defense Department is the only department of Government which will actually reduce the number of its employees in the coming fiscal year. Every other department, without exception, will increase its employees in the coming budget year. Here are a few examples: Agriculture by a whopping 5,000, or 4 percent; Treasury by 4,000, or 5 percent; Interior by 4,000, or 6 percent; Health, Education, and Welfare by 6,000, or 7½ percent; General Services Administration by 3,000, or 9 percent; Commerce by 3,500, or 11 percent; and Labor by 1,300, or 14 percent. All of these increases will come in a single year—next year.

Asked about this sharp increase in employees in the coming year when they appeared before the committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and others all told the committee the increase was the result of new programs the Congress had passed.

But the Secretary of Commerce was most revealing when asked to defend the huge 11-percent increase in 1 year in personnel in his Department. He said that if he were given a free hand to reduce or eliminate old programs he could, in fact, reduce personnel by 10 percent and operate a better Department.

The Secretary of Commerce wisely pointed to the failure of the administration and Congress alike to look with critical scrutiny to economy in old programs which have developed powerful bureaucratic and often special interest support but no longer serve our national interest.

EXTRAVAGANT SUBSIDIES TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

The explosive expansion of some of the older programs with the hell-bent support of special interest shows how extravagantly generous with the taxpayer's money Congress has become when it teams up with subsidy-seeking interests.

For instance, just since 1957—to the coming year's 1964 budget—Federal spending for water transportation subsidy to shipbuilders has leaped from \$365 to \$677 million or 85 percent—these figures only include direct expenditure subsidies; in addition, the water transportation industry obtains substantial hidden subsidies in the form of preferential tax treatment—subsidies to privately owned commercial aviation have zoomed from \$219 to \$885 million, or

fourfold; and promotion of business from \$127 to \$617 million, or an incredible fivefold.

Reducing entrenched, special-interest-supported spending is one of the toughest jobs of Government. It will become even tougher as "the establishment" persuades the Congress and the American people to accept the theory that larger Federal deficits fed alike by tax cuts and/or increased Government spending would lead to sound long-term growth.

But the theory is wrong. In fact, reduction of unjustified Government spending not only will not hurt economic expansion, it will help it. Wasteful Government spending diverts resources of skilled men and scarce material from constructive private uses. As the Government's massive purchasing power moves in, prices move up. The eventual burden on the taxpayer is sure and heavy.

SOME DOMESTIC SPENDING ESSENTIAL

This is not to say that all Government spending can only be an anchor that private enterprise must drag along—far from it. Spending that encourages manpower training, vocational education, industrial research, contributes to the very essence of a growing economy.

The tough job of Government is to adopt and advance the programs that will, in fact, advance the economy as well as to eradicate the programs that burden it.

There is no question in this Senator's mind, however, that in every phase of Government activity, including defense and space, spending can be reduced an aggregate of billions below the President's requests, possibly to a level permitting a sound tax cut.

ECONOMISTS FAIL TO PROVE TAX CUT WILL WORK

The case for the proposed tax cut, timed to coincide with both a present deficit and increased spending, and calculated to deepen the deficit, has not been made. It has not been made in these respects:

RECORD OF PREVIOUS TAX CUTS

First. The tax cut may have little or no stimulative effect on the economy. After only four of the nine tax cuts in the past 40 years did business significantly improve. There were times it actually got worse. This does not prove the so-called stimulative multiplier did not appear; it does show it can be washed out by other factors. This would seem to be almost certain for the \$2.7 billion net tax cut proposed for the first tax cut year in this \$550 billion economy.

Even the ultimate \$10 billion net tax cut would seem to be likely to be washed out. For this ultimate grand total would amount to less than 2 percent of the gross national product. During the thirties, deficits that averaged more than twice this—4 percent—of the gross national product seemed to have little effect on economic growth.

MONETARY RESTRAINT WILL WEAKEN TAX CUT STIMULATION

Second. Any substantial stimulative effect of the tax cut would almost certainly be sharply cut and perhaps even destroyed by the restraining effect of

monetary policy. The country's top monetary authorities, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, both told the committee that they expected interest rates would be likely to rise if the economy moved ahead in 1963 and 1964. In view of the monetary power of these gentlemen, it is almost a sure thing that this expectation will be translated into reality. Interest rates will go up. Monetary authorities have publicly indicated that they will raise interest rates on savings bonds to 4 percent within the next year.

Monetary authorities appearing before the committee, other than the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, universally agreed that rising interest rates would slow down economic expansion. Dr. Meltzer, of Carnegie Tech, argued that the stimulative effect—multiplier—of the tax cut would depend almost entirely on the degree of monetary tightness.

The virtual certainty of this monetary tightness will surely develop for two reasons: (a) a policy of raising interest rates is regarded as the prime weapon for diminishing the adverse effect of the tax cut on the balance of payments; (b) rising interest rates are accepted as the ready tool to try to forestall the inflationary effect of the tax cut.

The majority report, in my view, does an excellent job of describing the problems of monetary policy with which we will be concerned in the months to come. Moreover, it indicates clearly the weaknesses in some of the monetary policies followed during the last few years. I wish to be specifically on record in support of the monetary section of the majority report.

TIGHT MONETARY POLICY WILL NOT IMPROVE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

Incidentally, the preponderance of evidence from the joint committee's hearings last August and this year suggests that interest rate differentials can have only secondary effects on the balance of payments through influencing capital flows. Harvard Professor Philip Bell and Federal Reserve Economist Robert Gemmill have made the only available studies of the effect of interest rate differentials on capital flows and they have found the effect is far less significant than speculation and of far lesser significance than previously supposed. Neither of these studies was contradicted by any other studies that were brought to the attention of the committee, although witnesses appearing before the committee were systematically challenged to show any evidence to contradict the Bell and Gemmill studies.

This means the Government's monetary policy will be restrictive, will tend to counteract any stimulative effect of the tax cut, largely because of a false assumption—now exploded—that interest rates must be higher in this country to stem capital flows from this country overseas.

As for using rising interest rates to forestall the inflationary effect of the tax cuts, the principal architect of this policy, Chairman William Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, himself indi-

cated that the policy would have only moderate effect in restraining rising prices. And yet this policy of monetary restraint to raise interest rates is the widely accepted answer to whatever inflation may develop in the future: not reduced Government spending, not increased taxes. Both are regarded as politically impossible.

The basic economic design—increased Government spending and lower taxes to stimulate the economy and rising interest rates to stabilize prices—is likely to lead to a cruelly oppressive debt burden as rising deficits are matched by rising interest rates required to service the heavier national debt.

What is worse, it means an economy-wide restraining force, slowing down homebuilding—where interest is the biggest cost—small business borrowing, and generally shifting a heavier burden to such debtor groups as farmers and consumers.

CASE FOR CORPORATE TAX CUT NOT MADE

Third, The heaviest and most consistent support for the tax cut came from those who argued that it was necessary to stimulate investment. No witnesses contradicted the alleged wisdom of such a tax cut. Almost all argued it was desirable to promote economic growth in the economy.

And yet the case for such a tax cut this year seems to be even weaker than it has been in the recent past. Let us review the record:

In 1954 the Nation enjoyed its last major tax cut. It was generally agreed that the prime beneficiaries of that tax cut were corporations. That tax cut was said to have been designed to stimulate investment in view of both its individual impact—most of the benefits went to persons in investment income brackets—and its large corporate reduction.

Now, 9 years later, the Congress is asked to make another sizable corporate tax reduction. One distinguished Senator remarked as the committee hearing opened that the 1954 tax cut seems to have had a long-term adverse effect on the economy because it stimulated investment between 1955 and 1957 to such an extent that the economy has been characterized by idle investment facilities, overbuilt plant capacity, unemployment, and slow growth ever since.

Just last year investment was stimulated by two additional tax reductions. First, depreciation guidelines were revised to provide the equivalent of a \$1.5 billion stimulant to investment—and relief to corporations.

Secondly, the investment credit was rifle shot into corporate taxation to provide a specific and high-powered stimulus to investment through a 7-percent tax credit for every dollar of investment made.

The argument for further stimulation by tax cut is feeble indeed in view of these facts: First, the overwhelming preponderance of recent tax reduction on the side of stimulating investment; second, cash earnings in 1961 exceeded investment by a record absolute amount of \$18½ billion and a record of 62 percent; third, although later figures are not available, cash earnings have been soar-

ing since then while plant and equipment outlays have been about the same. The result: corporations have never been in a better cash position to invest in plant and equipment.

All the tax-incentive stimulation of the past seems to have done little to move business investment in plant and equipment ahead. In view of the recency of the 1962 corporate tax reductions, it would seem to be wiser to give these "investment stimulants" a chance to work rather than to hit again in a time of deficit spending with another "trickle down" investment tax cut.

MANY GROUPS HURT BY TAX CUT

Finally, there are many groups in the American society who would be hurt, not helped, by this tax cut.

FUTURE TAXPAYER BURDENED

The preeminent victim, of course, is the future taxpayer. As Dr. James Buchanan, chairman of the Economics Department of the University of Virginia, has written, the inevitable tendency of the politician is to spend for the present voter, reduce taxes for the present taxpayer, and mitigate the consequences by raising interest rates, thereby passing the whole burden to the future taxpayer. When Congress's economic experts on this committee, to whom Congress must look for advice, contend that such a policy is sound economics as well as effective short-run politics, the combination may be all but irresistible.

FARMER HIT

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman testified for the tax cut but conceded that a substantial majority of America's farmers owe no income tax. Obviously for these farmers—who make a heavy investment of work, property, risk, and efficiency in their farms—the tax cut is meaningless. No one argues that America will buy or consume more food because of the tax cut. To the extent the tax cut sparks inflation and forces increased interest rates—and it seems certain to do both—the farmer is sure to be hit and hurt, and badly.

LITTLE BENEFIT TO UNEMPLOYED

Above all, this planned tax-cut deficit has been justified in the name of the unemployed. But the tough question that this Senator has encountered in talking to unemployed in Wisconsin is, "What good is a tax cut to an unemployed man with no income? He doesn't pay any taxes now. He doesn't need a tax cut. He needs a job."

An answer that the tax cut may stimulate the economy to provide more jobs is, as the previous analysis suggests, far from perfect.

It is especially ironic for the three groups which the Secretary of Labor told the committee form a disproportionately heavy part of the unemployed: the high school dropout; the unskilled; the minority groups. According to the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, each of these groups suffers not 6-percent unemployment but more than 12-percent unemployment.

Tax cuts will not begin to solve the problems of high school dropouts, unable to get jobs because of inadequate education and low or zero skills. Tax cuts

will do little to knock down the prejudice barriers barring the minority groups from employment.

Few of the unskilled are likely to win jobs because of the tax cut. Their barrier is their lack of skill in an automating, technologically changing society. These people need training. A tax cut to solve their problem seems as heartless and stupid as Marie Antoinette's "Let 'em eat cake," for starving Parisians.

The unemployed in these groups will enjoy little benefit in income with a tax cut. They pay no Federal income tax; nor is it likely to help them get jobs.

To the extent the deficit drives up interest rates, these people who are likely to be debtors will suffer. To the extent the deficit drives up prices, they will all be hurt as consumers.

OLD PEOPLE HIT HARDEST

Of all groups in America, the hardest hit by this tax cut-sparked deficit will be the retired old people.

On February 15, 1963, the Treasury Department released a fact sheet showing that of the 18 million Americans 65 years old and over, 14½ million, or 80 percent, have such low incomes that they pay no Federal income tax now.

So 80 percent of the older people could not possibly receive any benefit from an income tax cut. Since the overwhelming majority of the 20 percent of oldsters

who do pay income taxes pay very little, the benefit would in aggregate be very small indeed.

On the other hand, many of these older people are debtors. The rising interest rates which seem to be the certain concomitant of the income tax cut will come out of their already pitifully inadequate incomes. Rising prices—a likely companion of any Federal deficit stimulation of the economy—would likewise diminish what little they could buy with the income they have.

PROPOSED TAX CUT REGRESSIVE

Administration witnesses have contended that the proposed tax cut is a progressive one which will give low-income groups the greatest benefit. This is simply not true.

The following table shows the benefits to various economic groups from the personal income tax cuts—including the progressive reforms recommended by the administration. This table shows a precisely opposite effect from the table usually shown by the administration. This is because the administration table shows the percentage reduction of the income tax paid by persons in each income bracket. Because persons in high-income brackets of course pay higher income taxes, the administration table suggests the tax cut would be progressive.

| Income | Federal income tax | Other taxes ¹ | Total tax before cut | Total tax after cut | Percent reduction |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| \$3,000..... | \$60 | \$600 | \$660 | \$614 | 7 |
| \$5,000..... | 420 | 1,000 | 1,420 | 1,296 | 8 |
| \$10,000..... | 1,372 | 1,500 | 2,872 | 2,568 | 10 |
| \$15,000..... | 2,616 | 1,700 | 4,316 | 3,776 | 13 |
| \$20,000..... | 4,124 | 1,900 | 6,024 | 5,182 | 14 |

¹Property (or imputed rent), sales, excise, auto, etc.

That the tax cut is, in fact, regressive, is demonstrated in the above table which shows the percentage reduction in all taxes paid that results from the administration recommendations. Because all Federal taxpayers pay heavy State and local taxes in addition to Federal taxes, this table shows a far more ac-

curate picture of what actually happens to the taxpayer's total liability.

The impact of the President's tax proposal on various income groups was dramatically shown in a table submitted to the committee by Dr. Leon Keyserling. This table eloquently dramatizes the regressive effect of the proposed tax cut.

President's proposed tax structure in 1965 compared with present structure (1962), at various tax levels (for married couple with 2 children)

| (1) Taxable income level | (2) Present tax ¹ | (3) Present income after tax | (4) Proposed tax ² | (5) Proposed income after tax | (6) Percent tax reduction | (7) Percent increase in after-tax income | (8) Percent tax to income | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------|
| | | | | | | | Present | Proposed |
| \$3,000..... | \$60 | \$2,940 | 0 | \$3,000 | 100.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0 |
| \$5,000..... | 420 | 4,580 | \$280 | 4,720 | 33.3 | 3.1 | 8.4 | 5.6 |
| \$7,500..... | 877 | 6,623 | 663 | 6,837 | 24.4 | 3.2 | 11.7 | 8.8 |
| \$10,000..... | 1,372 | 8,628 | 1,068 | 8,932 | 22.2 | 3.5 | 13.7 | 10.7 |
| \$15,000..... | 2,486 | 12,514 | 2,076 | 12,924 | 16.5 | 3.3 | 16.6 | 13.8 |
| \$25,000..... | 5,318 | 19,682 | 4,605 | 20,395 | 13.4 | 3.6 | 21.3 | 18.4 |
| \$35,000..... | 9,037 | 25,963 | 7,814 | 27,186 | 13.5 | 4.7 | 25.8 | 22.3 |
| \$50,000..... | 15,976 | 34,024 | 13,837 | 36,163 | 13.4 | 6.3 | 32.0 | 27.7 |
| \$100,000..... | 44,724 | 55,276 | 38,542 | 61,458 | 13.8 | 11.2 | 44.7 | 38.5 |
| \$200,000..... | 115,224 | 84,776 | 95,072 | 104,928 | 17.5 | 23.8 | 57.6 | 47.5 |

¹ Assuming 10 percent deduction for taxes, interest, contributions, medical, etc.

² Assuming President's proposal, as revised by Dillon's testimony, of \$400 minimum deduction for married couple and \$100 for each child; 10 percent for incomes between \$6,000 and \$10,000; \$10,000 flat deduction between \$1,000 and \$20,000; and 5 percent deduction for \$20,000 and up.

Actual slight deviations from these workable assumptions would not in the slightest change the general import of the analysis.

Because tens of millions of American adults earn so little income that they pay no Federal income taxes, it is obvious that a significant share of our citi-

zens will get no benefit but will almost certainly have to pay higher interest rates because of the tax cut and, very possibly, higher prices.

TAX CUT WORSENS ADVERSE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Witnesses were systematically asked what effect the proposed tax cut would have on the balance of payments.

It was generally conceded that the tax cut would worsen our balance of payments because the main thrust of the cut is to increase demand in the consumer sector. This would mean that purchases of imports would rise sharply.

On the other hand, far from reducing American prices to enable us to sell more abroad and increase exports, this tax cut, as Professor Duesenberry properly pointed out in the hearings, will certainly, inevitably, tend to increase prices and reduce our exports.

So the proposed tax cut would worsen our balance of payments by first, increasing imports and second, decreasing exports.

HEAVY COST OF TAX CUT FAILURE

Administration witnesses argued that if the tax cut fails to stimulate the economy as advertised, little has been lost. This is emphatically not true. If this highly questionable gamble, this radical new departure from American fiscal policy, is adopted and fails, the consequences will be serious indeed.

First. The already heavy national debt will be even more burdensome.

Second. Our present progressive income tax system will have been seriously jeopardized with little real political prospect of restoring it. It is hard to imagine a more difficult political task than increasing taxes back to their present rate once Congress cuts them. The alternative frankly advocated by Dr. Burns and other witnesses: a national sales tax. In the judgment of this Senator, this would be a first-class economic disaster as well as a gross injustice.

Third. Our antirecession ammunition—the real justification for a tax cut—will have been used up, leaving us far less equipped to cope with economic adversity.

Fourth. Our balance of payments will have been worsened both because imports will have been increased relative to exports and because the great American economy will have failed to respond to the prime economic prescription of its President and suffered a growing deficit.

Fifth. The most essential ingredient in economic success for a free nation—public confidence—will have been severely and needlessly damaged because of the failure of a highly advertised prime economic policy of our Government.

Sixth. The essential ingredient for discipline in Federal spending—that tax relief depends on spending reduction—will have been lost. This adverse consequence is even more sure to follow if the tax-cut prescription succeeds than if it fails.

And, in the long run, this may be the most serious threat of all in the tax-cut-for-a-deficit philosophy. For once the conviction tak's hold that economic prosperity can be firmly based on deficit financing then the incentive to spending discipline will be lost and the trend to bigger and bigger government that is the consequence of unrestrained spending could become irresistible.

DOVER EDITORIAL COMMENDS LAUSCHE STRIP-MINING BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio is known by all of us to be an outstanding example of prudent and thoughtful conservatism. He is a man who is opposed to excessive Government spending. I think that the proposed legislation he has introduced also shows he has a wider conservative viewpoint. He is deeply concerned with what may happen to our resources, and is anxious to fight and fight hard to preserve our resources for future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine editorial published in the Daily Reporter of Dover, Ohio, which discusses the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], as to regulating strip mining, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

There has been much discussion recently, and no little amount of controversy, over strip-mining operations. Most of the criticism has been aimed at operators who have not engaged in restoration after stripping a given area.

An Ohio law requires strip operators to post bonds to assure they will try to put the land back into decent shape. But the law admittedly lacks sharp teeth and those fighting for backfills maintain that too many strippers are simply ignoring the law.

Generally speaking, strip-mining control has been viewed as a problem for individual States, because they must contend with the yawning canyons, which are hazardous for man and animal alike; the sulfur water, which contaminates springs and streams, and the disrupted land which, for the most part, is useless except reforestation, even when it is put back into some semblance of order.

But last Wednesday Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, involved the Federal Government in surface mining when he introduced a bill calling for the Secretary of the Interior to make a study of strip and surface coal operations and report back to Congress.

Admitting the economic benefits of strip mining, Senator LAUSCHE also deplored the fact that such operations have "destroyed all other usefulness of the land and has left abominable, grotesque scars."

The Senator further charged that in his home State of Ohio, where he served as Governor, "there are large areas where, as a result of stripping operations, public highways have suffered severe damage by reason of slippage; streams, lakes, and wells have been polluted; wildlife cover has been destroyed; and, finally, the entire areas themselves have been abandoned as unproductive and virtual wasteland. The future economy of these areas is seriously threatened."

Senator LAUSCHE cited Ohio's current strip-mine reclamation law as having been helpful in land restoration but added: "I've always felt it should have required more strict conservation measures."

The senior Buckeye Senator said he feels "Congress should determine in what manner and in what degree it would have responsibility in helping to restore to usefulness these ever-growing numbers of acres of desolation."

If Congress eventually enacts a reclamation law governing coal-stripping operations, the taxpayers will foot the bill for its administration. Considering that only 35 cents of every tax dollar sent to Washington comes back, it would be far less expensive for Ohioans if the general assembly would wake up and amend the Buckeye laws covering

reclamation. A well-teethed law would put the burden on the strip miners and not the taxpayers.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROX- MIRE BEFORE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO FOREST PRODUCTS LABORA- TORY, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have a statement which I made this morning before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations relating to the urgent need for an appropriation for the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis., printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROX- MIRE BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUB- COMMITTEE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRI- ATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to appear in support of a \$3.8-million appropriation for a badly needed addition at the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis.

Last year this committee recognized the vital importance of the project and recommended an appropriation of \$380,000 to carry out the planning stage of the Laboratory's expansion program. The Senate stood behind this recommendation, but the House cut it back in conference to \$200,000, or just enough to cover the costs of the most essential planning.

I am happy to report that this initial appropriation has been used wisely. After careful screening and negotiation, two firms have been chosen to design and engineer the highly-specialized, 170,000-square-foot addition to the Laboratory's crowded, 30-year-old plant. Within a year the blueprints will be completed and the project will be ready for its long-overdue groundbreaking on 12 acres of adjacent land donated by the University of Wisconsin.

To carry out the program smoothly and economically, construction funds must be appropriated now. This will allow bidding for the construction job to take place next spring, when a buyer's market for construction services is expected. Waiting until next year to make this grant will almost certainly postpone construction until the summer months, a time when the building trade is normally operating at near-maximum capacity.

Mr. Chairman, the existing condition of the Forest Products Laboratory plant, its keystone role in the wood products industry, and the industry's significance in our national economy all point up the necessity of making this requested investment of Federal funds. The laboratory plant is simply substandard for the work that now goes on in it.

This work is universally acclaimed as the finest and most extensive in the world today, and it is a tribute to the Laboratory's excellent staff that so much has been done for so long in so little space. But talking to scientists, technicians, and administrators has convinced me that the miracle of the forest products research cannot continue under conditions as they now exist at the Laboratory.

Even without considering the many new avenues of research which are closed off for lack of adequate facilities, there are several older projects which cannot be fully developed for the simple and exasperating reason that the present structure cannot adequately contain them.

Among these I would cite as a critical example the case of high-speed paper formation. Here is an area which is on the verge of a real breakthrough, one which industry is anxiously awaiting because it would unfold new vistas for the use of secondary-quality hardwoods. To achieve this breakthrough, extensive experiments with new processing machinery are required.

Only the Laboratory can do this in a manner which will benefit the entire paper and pulp industry, yet the present laboratory building has neither the space nor the modern load-bearing requirements to support the necessary equipment. As a result, further progress toward perfection of this process and the consequent stimulation of a multimillion dollar industry, must await congressional approval of these construction funds.

In 1961, the wood products industry provided direct employment for more than 1.1 million people—over 7 percent of the total manufacturing labor force. In the same year the value of all forest products after shipment was \$25 billion, or roughly 5 percent of the Nation's gross national product. Of this amount, only \$1 billion is attributable to the value of the raw materials; of the remaining added value, a great percentage can be traced to processes and techniques which originated at the Forest Products Laboratory.

Here is an industry which ranks sixth in terms of employment and eighth in terms of value added in the hierarchy of the American economy. Yet, public and private expenditures on research now average only a pitiful 0.35 percent of its annual contribution to gross national product, while the national average in all manufacturing industries is 2.5 percent—higher by a factor of 7.

Back in 1957, the President's Commission on Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products pinpointed this deficiency as an urgent one and recommended a more than fourfold expansion in Forest Products Laboratory research. In outlining a 10-year program during which funds for research would be increased over \$1 million in each year, this bipartisan Commission estimated that the resulting ratio of research expenditures to product value would still be worse than the 1957 figure. From this it is clear that the Commission's recommendations represented the absolute minimum in intelligent research planning.

But today—6 years later and at a time when industrial research commands an unprecedented priority in our economy—the Forest Products Laboratory is confined to a building which has been unimproved during the entire 30-year period since it was constructed. And I want to emphasize that approval of this construction appropriation of \$3.8 million would fall far short of meeting the Presidential Commission's 1957 recommendations.

Because we failed to heed the Commission's warning, the wood products industry has come in for some rough sledding. A sure indication that research has not kept pace with economic realities is the mounting level of foreign competition. In 1961, for example, exports of lumber and wood products dropped 12 percent from 1960, while imports rose a full 8.3 percent.

This unfavorable trend in our pattern of trade reflects rising costs of production here at home. The cost of harvesting and sawing raw timber has alone risen four times faster in the last decade than the general wholesale price index. This cost-price squeeze has meant that many stands of second-quality timber in the midcontinent forest regions are simply not being cut to allowable or desirable limits, and many other stands are being sold at very depressed stump prices. The result is that Government revenues from sales of forest land stumpage are substantially reduced for lack of new cost-saving

processes in the industry and new methods of wood resource utilization.

Of all the uses to which \$3.8 million of Government funds could be put perhaps no other would pay off so quickly in the form of direct returns. The 1957 Presidential Commission report I referred to a moment ago states that for every \$1 invested in the Forest Products Laboratory, \$70 has come back to the Federal Government by way of resulting tax revenues.

There is still another return on investment which the Forest Products Laboratory yields to the Federal Government, one which is even more direct than the revenues resulting from the Laboratory's research. The Government, by virtue of its ownership of forest lands, is the major supplier of the wood products industry's raw materials. Recently about one-fifth of the annual cuttings in the country have been from Government-owned and managed lands. And Government holdings are greater than this would indicate; they comprise 45 percent of the national wood resources at the stump. The value of these holdings is directly related to the value of the products which can be made from them. This in turn is immediately dependent on the development of new uses and new techniques of manufacture. And that is the mission of the Forest Products Laboratory, one which it alone can perform for an industry whose small enterprises account for 60 percent of the boardfeet produced.

I would like to submit several exhibits for the record which expand on my statement today and indicate some of the many significant contributions which the Laboratory has made in the past, as well as promising projects for future research. I am confident that the committee will give this request for construction funds the close and favorable attention it deserves, just as it last year treated the appropriation for planning expenses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Wisconsin has the smallest amount of Federal spending per capita, I believe, of any State in the Union. I know Wisconsin has the smallest number of Federal employees per capita of any State in the Nation.

This Forest Products Laboratory is one of the few Federal installations in Wisconsin. The installation has paid for itself many times. A Presidential commission in 1957 estimated that for every dollar spent in the research institute in Madison, the Federal Government has received \$70 in direct tax revenues back, because of the enormous benefits which the Forest Product Laboratory research has been able to develop for our economy.

I think it would be a real disservice if the appropriation were delayed, because this money will return itself to the Federal Government many, many times in research, which is desperately needed.

I think we have grossly neglected our industrial research in this country, while concentrating on necessary space research and defense research.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RELAXATION OF CONTROLS ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I find very little good news for the people of Maine in the announcement today of the so-called relaxation of controls on residual oil imports.

I fear that it will actually falsely raise the hopes of the people of Maine who have been going through a very severe winter. Recently the president of the United Mine Workers in emerging from a conference with President Kennedy announced that President Kennedy had given him assurance that there would be no meaningful relaxation of restrictions against residual oil imports.

A close examination of the announcement today reveals that such assurance has been carried out and that this does not constitute a meaningful relaxation of existing restrictions against residual oil imports.

What was reported in the Washington Post yesterday by reporter Julius Duschka is proved true today by the announcement. I quote excerpts from his article:

The hottest international oil issue facing the White House reportedly has been resolved largely in favor of domestic economic and political considerations.

Last month Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, recommended to President Kennedy that the administration undertake "a careful and meaningful relaxation" of the controls.

Despite this recommendation, the White House was reported yesterday to have decided to permit a smaller increase in imports than it allowed in the last year.

The decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers.

The announcement today establishes Mr. Duschka's accurate prereporting for the increase is smaller than it was last year and "the decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers."

In that victory for the coal producers and domestic oil producers—like the Texas oil millionaires—the decision is a significant defeat for the people of Maine and for the little consumers. For the gain of the Texas oil millionaires by the Kennedy decision is a loss by the man in the street and the woman in the home in Maine.

As the United Mine Workers president reported the other day on President Kennedy's assurances of no meaningful relaxation of the restrictions, so today the truth of his report is confirmed by the announcement of the fact that the small increase is even smaller than it was last year. In other words, as far as the people of Maine are concerned the trend is not forward with vigor—the President has not made a meaningful relaxation.

I do not think that it is an exaggeration to say that today's announcement and the grandiose claims made in connection with it are dangerously close to constituting "false and misleading advertising" creating false hopes and designed to make things seem what they are, in reality, not.

The most charitable thing that can be said about today's announcement is that it is "too little and too late"—too little since it is even less of an increase than what we received a year ago—and too late since it comes just a week before the official end of winter, and highest heating oil prices, when the need for the residual oil was at its greatest.

This pattern is getting old and worn out as far as Maine is concerned. In

connection with this matter, there is an excellent editorial in the March 8, 1963, issue of the Bangor Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

MORE LIKE THE HORSE AND BUGGY DAYS

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH had some pungent and pertinent criticism to make of the New Frontier administration at the recent monthly meeting of the Maine delegation in Congress.

The Kennedy administration, she declared, devotes too much time to talk and studies, and too little to action. For this reason, she declined to join the delegation in sending another appeal to the President for the removal of quotas on residual oil imports.

"I don't think a letter from the delegation amounts to a row of pins," she told her colleagues. "I think a pattern has developed. The President talks about oil, textiles, and equalizing the pay for shipyard workers at Kittery. First, there's a study, then a report, then a letter. What good does a study do? It's a case of too much words and too little action."

Unfortunately for the State of Maine, what Senator Smith says is all too true. The administration continues to dawdle over restricting textile imports that are hurting Maine and other textile States. It does nothing about lifting oil import quotas which are adding some \$30 million annually to New England's fuel bill, though Kennedy himself urged just such action when he was serving Massachusetts as a U.S. Senator. Equalization of shipyard pay is another perennial and unresolved issue.

Of course, it is an old bureaucratic custom to stall when a matter is controversial. But for an administration that rode into office on a campaign stressing vigor and action, the New Frontier is uncommonly prone to balking and shying. It needs spurs—and perhaps a burr or two under the saddle.

THE FLOODS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today I introduced before the Senate Public Works Committee, resolutions directing the Corps of Engineers to review its reports of survey on flood protection facilities for the Kentucky, Upper Cumberland, and Big Sandy Rivers, taking into consideration the extensive damage caused in these valleys by floods in the last few days. The last resolutions for the survey of the Big Sandy and Kentucky Rivers were introduced by Senator Earle Clements and myself in 1953-54. The last such survey on the Upper Cumberland River, that is above Cumberland Falls, was introduced by me in 1957.

The purpose of the three resolutions which I have introduced today is to enable the Corps of Engineers to determine whether additional reservoirs and local flood-protection facilities in the three valleys can now meet the cost-benefit ratio required by the Corps of Engineers, under law, by reason of the additional information of great damage caused by the flood which has just ravaged these valleys. Specifically, one purpose is to have the corps reexamine the following sites which were previously studied:

Kentucky River Valley: Line Fork Reservoir site above Hazard, Ky., and Lothair, Ky., which suffered great flood damage.

Walker's Creek Reservoir site in Lee County.

Hazard and Lothair, for local flood protection facilities.

Upper Cumberland River: Martin's Fork Reservoir site above Harlan, Ky.; Cumberland, Ky., and Harlan, Ky., for local flood protection; Barbourville, Ky., and Pineville, Ky., to determine if height of flood walls should be increased and walls should be strengthened.

Big Sandy: Paint Creek Reservoir site, to protect Paintsville; Pond Creek Reservoir site on Tug Fork branch of Big Sandy; Beaver Creek, channeling and deepening to protect Martin, Ky.

While I have named these specific sites, my resolution would also authorize the Corps of Engineers to determine if other reservoir sites and local flood protection facilities, such as flood walls, cutoffs, and channel improvement, would provide adequate protection.

I point out that several of the reservoir and local flood protection sites I have specified were studied by the Corps of Engineers under the authority of the surveys which Senator Clements and I introduced, but that it was found by the Corps of Engineers—on the basis of information available from past floods—that construction could not be approved, because they did not meet the cost-benefit ratio required by law. I believe that the new evidence of damage caused by the present flood will provide the Corps of Engineers with facts which could bring the cost-benefit ratio of some of the additional projects within the requirements of the law, and make them eligible for approval and construction.

I have talked to officials of the Corps of Engineers, and they have told me that my resolutions providing authority to them to study additional flood protection in the three river valleys would be useful.

I have also written today to the President and to Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, asking that the Corps of Engineers be requested to provide to the Bureau of the Budget a statement of its highest capabilities in terms of appropriations to speed up the construction of Fishtrap Reservoir on the Big Sandy, presently under construction; to increase its funds for preconstruction engineering at Carr Fork; to provide funds for preconstruction engineering at Laurel River; and for funds to initiate construction of Cave Run Reservoir on the Licking River. These are the only projects which are ready for appropriations. I believe that funds can be added to speed up the completion of these projects by at least 1 year. Funds are now available to complete construction of the local flood protection project at Carbon.

The Kentucky, upper Cumberland, Big Sandy, and Licking Rivers have been swept by floods for almost 100 years, and many of them have been recorded by the Corps of Engineers. The people of these areas have suffered property losses running into the millions of dollars. The 1957 flood caused damage in the Kentucky River Valley alone on the order of \$10 million. Further, these floods deter and prevent the economic improvement of eastern Kentucky which, unfor-

tunately, has been designated as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment. And most tragic, many lives have been lost in the floods which have swept these valleys.

Within the last 10 years, the Congress has initiated the first substantial efforts to give flood protection to eastern Kentucky. On the Big Sandy River, Fishtrap, Pound, and Flannagan Reservoirs are under construction, and Prestonsburg has been provided partial local flood protection. On the Kentucky River, Buckhorn Reservoir has been completed and local flood protection provided at Jackson. Funds are in the present budget for the preconstruction work at Carrs Fork Reservoir; Booneville Reservoir had been previously authorized.

On the upper Cumberland River floodwalls have been constructed at Pineville and Barbourville, and funds are now available to complete construction of flood protection projects for Corbin. All preconstruction work has been completed at Laurel for Laurel Reservoir, and it is ready for construction appropriations. Funds are included in the 1964 budget to complete the survey of Rock Castle Reservoir. We are urging the authorization of Devils Jump Reservoir.

All of this has been done since 1953, but full protection for these valleys must be provided.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I will urge a speedy review by the Corps of Engineers of projects which can give the best possible protection to these valleys; and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee for Public Works, I will urge the increase of appropriations for projects under construction, and projects ready for construction during this session of the Congress.

The members of our Kentucky delegation in the House and Senate, of both parties, have worked together to secure flood protection for eastern Kentucky, as well as other sections of Kentucky, and we will continue to do so in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MCGOVERN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, before this week ends I believe there should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine piece of political writing which appeared in last Sunday's Washington Star, on March 10, 1963, under the caption "McGOVERN's Political Unorthodoxy." The article was written by George W. Oakes, a contributing writer in the Washington Star.

It is a fine piece of political interpretation, as well as narrative writing and historical writing, about the reorganization of the Democratic Party in South Dakota under the leadership of the present occupant of the chair [Mr. McGovern in the chair], who was inspired by Adlai Stevenson in 1952 to give up a position he held, as a Ph. D., of a professorship in a college and to get out into every day politics; and how his long organizational effort revitalized the Democratic Party in South Dakota and placed

him in the Senate, and gave great impetus for better government in his State.

I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota for his great contribution to better government in America and the two-party development in his State and to greater participation by many of the young people in his State in politics, as well as widespread participation by many groups in his State who theretofore had been quiescent.

I am proud to serve in this body with one who has contributed so much to the revitalization of governmental activity and to the political life in his own State.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed with my remarks at this point in the RECORD. I regret that the accompanying fine photograph cannot be printed under the rules.

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

MCGOVERN'S POLITICAL UNORTHODOXY

(By George W. Oakes)

The South Dakota election which sent GEORGE MCGOVERN to the U.S. Senate last fall was one of the most unusual in the State's history for many reasons.

In the first place, his victory by 597 votes out of more than 250,000 cast wasn't determined until completion of an official recount on December 6. It was the first recount in South Dakota in 26 years.

In second place, Mr. MCGOVERN almost singlehandedly built up the party that barely elected him. In 10 years the 40-year-old former history professor at Dakota Wesleyan University completely revitalized the Democratic Party in a traditionally Republican State by working at the grassroots.

"The job was really a one-man show," he said the other day in his Senate office. "I raised the money to pay my salary as executive secretary of the party and had no paid help at all. I spent long, hard days and nights traveling throughout the entire State.

"As a professor of history and government (Senator MCGOVERN took a Ph. D. degree in history at Northwestern under Prof. Arthur S. Link, Princeton historian and editor of the Woodrow Wilson papers) I naturally was interested in politics. Adlai Stevenson's 1952 campaign inspired me to take an active part myself. The fact that Adlai plunged so vigorously into the political battle made me want to help him. While I was teaching political science, I wrote a series of semi-historical articles for the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic tracing the record of the political parties. These articles caught the attention of the youthful Democratic State chairman who then asked me to work full time on the reorganization of the party which was in such a low state that there was no competition for leadership.

THE SLATE OF 1954

"Therefore the organization, such as it was, gave me a free hand. I developed a list of candidates and in 1954 we were able for the first time in years to offer the voters a full Democratic slate for county, State, and National office.

"At least once a week, I issued a press release on some State problem. Either I took issue with the Republicans or we offered a positive proposal. In 1955 I gave serious thought to becoming a candidate myself and began to take on a heavy speaking schedule, addressing meetings of Chambers of Commerce, Kiwanis, church groups, PTA's, etc., and spoke five or six times a week throughout the entire year.

"In January 1956, I announced my candidacy for Congress and resigned as executive secretary of the party. No one in South

Dakota history ever campaigned more intensively. I made as many as 10 or 12 appearances a day in that many different towns and went to every village in the eastern half of the State.

"We won, not only because of hard work and good party organization, but also because many Republicans realized that a two-party structure was in the best interests of the State. Competition improved each party and meant that South Dakota's representatives in Congress would be more responsive to the State's needs."

At the completion of his second term in the House, where he fought vigorously for agricultural reform, Mr. McGOVERN decided in 1960 to enter the senatorial contest against Senator KARL MUNDT. He was defeated in a Nixon statewide landslide carrying the entire Republican ticket. Observers attributed his defeat largely to voter uneasiness over the prospects of a Catholic President. Whereas Mr. Nixon won by 50,347 votes, Senator MUNDT received only 14,920 more votes than Mr. McGOVERN.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE JOB

For 2 years Mr. McGOVERN served as Director of Food-for-Peace in the Kennedy administration. He expanded the school lunch program so that 37 million youngsters in 80 countries are now fed with U.S. surplus farm products. He also started the plan for use of surplus grain in paying workers in developing countries.

The official canvass of the November senatorial election gave Mr. McGOVERN a 100-vote lead (128,581 to 128,481) over Republican Senator Joe Bottum who had been appointed to fill the unexpired term after Senator Francis Case's death last summer. Confident he could overturn the result, Mr. Bottum demanded a recount. Then the McGOVERN organization had to train its staff, mostly lawyers working on a voluntary basis, on procedures to be used. Recount schools were formed and a handbook was prepared. In each county a recount board, composed of the county judge and one member of each political party, undertook the task of checking each ballot in 94 percent of the State's precincts. In some counties the recount, which started November 26, lasted more than a week.

The board did not find any fraud but did discover many cases of ballots with identifying marks which are illegal in South Dakota.

A native South Dakotan, Senator McGOVERN is the son of a Methodist minister, an early settler in the State. After working his way through public school and Dakota Wesleyan University, he distinguished himself as a bomber pilot in World War II and received the DFC while serving with the 15th Air Force in Italy.

A six-footer, he is known among his colleagues on the Hill for his "quiet strength." As one of them remarked, "he doesn't push hard but he doesn't give ground either." One prominent Republican Congressman, who worked with the new Senator, recalls that he was a "civilized, self-effecting Member who expressed his views effectively and always was constructive."

APPRAISED BY A COLLEAGUE

"GEORGE is a shy person," commented a liberal House Democrat.

"He seems to shrink from the rough and tumble of politics. GEORGE will have influence in the Senate by winning gradually the confidence and respect of the other Members but it will take time."

During the recent fight over the Senate rules, Senator McGOVERN cast his vote with those Senators supporting the Anderson resolution which would have killed the filibuster by either a majority or three-fifths vote of the Senate.

Senator McGOVERN, though he may be shy and have a disarming manner, isn't afraid of tackling tough issues. He was the only Sen-

ator in this session to request assignment to the Agriculture Committee, which he received as well as Interior. A quarter century ago Agriculture was considered one of the most desirable posts.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a native South Dakotan, an old friend of McGOVERN's and an important influence in his political career, commented recently that "GEORGE is a patient man which I am not. He is geared temperamentally to the legislative process which many outstanding Senators are not. He is strong mentally and morally."

GEORGE McGOVERN comes to the Senate acclimated to the political and social life of Washington which is very important. The hardest period in a new Senator's life is the first 2 years because most new Senators are lost among the important people who crowd the Washington scene. But GEORGE has broad horizons—from Spink County, S. Dak., to New Delhi, India. He understands the world with which Congress must deal.

As Senator McGOVERN sees the task confronting him and the other freshman Senators, one quality "we will desperately need is a sense of history."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join with the able Senator from Texas in extending congratulations to the Senator from South Dakota on what he has accomplished. I congratulate also the people of the State of South Dakota for the great wisdom and judgment they exercised in sending him here as a U.S. Senator, where they will be most effectively served and represented by him.

I might say further that I understand that the present occupant of the chair made his maiden speech in the Senate today. He picked a most appropriate subject to talk about, because the junior Senator from Florida, in 1951, when he made his maiden speech, talked about Latin America. The able Senator from South Dakota has made his maiden speech on the same subject.

I listened with great interest to his speech. It was excellently done. I agree with most of his conclusions, though not with all of them. I now have him as a captive audience, and he will have to listen to my speech. It is possible that I may be able to convince him. At any rate, I join the Senator from Texas in congratulating the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his remarks, and I join him in congratulating the able and distinguished Senator from South Dakota and in congratulating the people of South Dakota for their good judgment. I desire to congratulate both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from South Dakota on making their maiden speeches on the subject of Latin America. Having been reared in a State that adjoins Latin America, and having lived for 3½ years in El Paso, Tex., at a border point, I assure both Senators that the subject has not been exhausted, and probably will not be in the lifetime of the three of us. I again congratulate the Senator from South Dakota.

PROPOSED NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have heard

some inaccurate and premature criticism of the proposed National Service Corps. Many of its critics did not have a clear idea of what the Service Corps would and would not do. Recently, George Kentera, a fine reporter for the Newark News, interviewed David L. Hackett, a special assistant to the Attorney General's office who played an important role in the planning of the Service Corps.

One important point made by Mr. Hackett when asked what control the Federal Government would have over Service Corps projects was:

Control and supervision would be in the hands of the local community or the agency. There would be no people from Washington telling them what to do. This would be a locally supervised and initiated program. The volunteers would be under local supervision.

The rest of the forthright interview will provide my colleagues with a clear idea of how the proposed Service Corps will work. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article and interview be included in the body of the RECORD.

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

ON THE RECORD—DOMESTIC CORPS SEEN "CONSCIENCE"

(By George Kentera)

WASHINGTON.—The major purpose of the proposed National Service Corps is to stimulate the American conscience about the vast problem of underprivileged Americans.

In the view of David L. Hackett, special assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the domestic corps is intended as an example, a catalyst, that would motivate millions of Americans to voluntary service in meeting grave community problems.

Hackett, 36, is Executive Director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and he played a leading role in setting up the proposed program for a domestic corps of full-time volunteers who would work for a year in problem areas.

INTERVIEWED BY NEWS

His comments on the National Service Corps, which under President Kennedy's proposals would reach a maximum size of 5,000 volunteers in 3 years, were made in a copyrighted "On the Record" interview with the Newark News, Detroit News, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Washington Star.

Hackett stressed that the domestic corps—operating in the same spirit of Peace Corps volunteers overseas—would work on locally supervised and locally initiated programs, and upon invitation by local agencies and institutions. An exception would be on Federal reservations, such as Indian lands; another might be work with migratory labor groups that cross State boundaries in their travel.

During preliminary studies on the advisability of a domestic corps, Hackett said, suggested programs were submitted by more than 40 localities.

"We expect a great many more requests once the program has passed Congress, many more requests than we can supply," he said. He added later, "we are not pretending this is going to solve all of these problems, but we think it is going to highlight them."

Hackett said he thought it would be more difficult to recruit volunteers into the domestic corps than had been the case in the Peace Corps. Serving in problem areas of

the United States, he said, would not be considered as glamorous as serving overseas, and in some areas the work would be more difficult.

EXPECTS LOCAL ACTION

The domestic corps would have to be careful, he said, that its recruits recognized the temptations of working in big cities. At the same time, he thought that domestic volunteers might be shocked at some conditions they might encounter.

"Many of us live in very comfortable circumstances," Hackett said, "and do not know the plight of the migratory worker or the Indian, or the Negro in Harlem. I think that is a role the catalyst is going to play."

He expressed the hope that the National Service Corps would, besides stimulating Americans to voluntary service on community problems, lead the individual States and communities to establish their own counterparts of the corps.

There are about 35 million volunteer workers in the United States now, Hackett said, but many more are needed, and the President's call on citizens "to serve their country will be the catalyst needed to get people who have talent and resources, who do not now involve themselves in community problems."

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS WOULD GIVE UNITED STATES AN EXAMPLE

(Following is the transcript of an "On the Record" interview with David L. Hackett, special assistant to the Attorney General, copyright 1963 by the Newark News, Detroit News, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Washington Star.)

Question. Mr. Hackett, the President has now proposed to Congress a National Service Corps and you, among others, were instrumental in shaping up the program. Could you tell us briefly what the National Service Corps is, how it is different from the regular Peace Corps and what its members will do?

Mr. HACKETT. Basically, the National Service Corps is conceived as an instrument by which a small group of people who give a year of their time will serve in locally initiated projects in this country.

The major purpose of the program would be to serve as an example. It is hoped that men and women serving full time in the corps would motivate many more Americans to serve in their local communities on a part-time basis.

Question. How large a corps do you envisage?

Mr. HACKETT. The recommendation that went to the President recommended not more than 5,000 at the maximum. This would be built up over a period of perhaps 3 years.

Question. Then the program would end?

Mr. HACKETT. I think it would continue; we would hope it would continue.

Question. Why not then have this program start on a local basis, rather than having a Federal group like the National Service Corps?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, there are approximately 35 million volunteers now in the country, and we feel that there is a need for many more. We feel that a certain amount of the prestige of the President in the call to serve their country will be the catalyst needed to get people who have talent and resources, who do not now involve themselves in community problems.

Question. Would the first National Service Corps workers go to work on a Federal reservation or in a Federal hospital, or would they start right in at the local community level?

Mr. HACKETT. I think they would start right at the local community level. There are areas where some people think the Federal Government has more direct responsibilities, such as the Indian problem, and

perhaps migratory labor. But during the study, we asked some local communities to develop model programs to see how they would use people, and we received over 40. We expect a great many more requests once the program has passed Congress, many more requests than we can supply.

Question. Where are some of these cities and States?

Mr. HACKETT. We had models from New York, Chicago, a migratory labor camp in California, several of the Indian reservations, and mental hospital plans in Massachusetts.

Question. Those five would be where you would probably start?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, they might be. There was no promise given.

Question. If there are 35 million volunteers already at work in this country, why do you think recruiting 5,000 federally paid people to assist them will have a big impact on the amount of volunteer work that is done?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, that is a good question. We would hope that these programs, developed at the local level, would be in the areas of greatest need. We would hope the programs would get more and more of the citizens within the community to concern themselves with the problems in the areas of greatest need.

For example, in Massachusetts young people from Harvard and Radcliffe work in mental hospitals. What these hospitals want to do now is to expand it statewide, and to attract young people from the colleges throughout Massachusetts. They would request, say, 30 to 40 corps people who would really act as agents to involve more and more young people from the colleges. There are in this country many examples of this. We are not at all critical of the volunteers who now serve. We just think that there need to be many more.

Question. If this is designed essentially as a catalyst process would it not be better to have professionally trained people go in and form the nucleus?

Mr. HACKETT. That is the problem. There are just not enough professionals.

Question. The Federal Government could not recruit 5,000 professionals?

Mr. HACKETT. I think that it could, but the cost would be great. We say that volunteers are one method by which this manpower shortage can be met. We are not pretending this is going to solve all of these problems, but we think it is going to highlight them.

Question. How costly will this effort be?

Mr. HACKETT. We have no definite figures, but the estimates for 1,000 volunteers run between \$4 million and \$6 million. The final cost will depend upon what the local contribution might be and what termination pay the corps volunteers might receive. The Peace Corps volunteers get \$75 a month, and there is a question of whether these will get the same.

Question. On recruitment, you sent out 22,000 questionnaires to college students, and 18,000 to elderly persons. Can you give us a breakdown of their replies?

Mr. HACKETT. They are still coming in. Of the ones we have received, the majority has shown a great deal of interest. I think recruiting is going to be a problem. I think it will be much more difficult to recruit in the domestic corps than the overseas Peace Corps.

Question. Why is that?

Mr. HACKETT. I think it is not as glamorous as serving in a foreign country. In some ways, the work there will be much more difficult than overseas. The temptations of working in the big cities are there, and we are going to have to be very careful in making sure that we get people who realize this.

The 60 Peace Corps people who trained in New York for Colombia, South America,

came from middle-class backgrounds. I think that they were appalled by the conditions they found in the slum areas in which they worked.

Some of them said, "why send us to South America?" They didn't really realize that these conditions existed in this country, 20 people in a room, with rats, and this type of thing. So we think it is going to be very much more difficult.

Question. What kinds of people are you looking for?

Mr. HACKETT. We know there is considerable interest among young people in college. There has been tremendous interest on the part of old people, retired people. I think these are two places where recruits could come from, but we would also hope there would be people in between who would give up a year to help. For example, the Attorney General is working with 20 young businessmen from around the country. I think there would be a variety of skills, from all types of backgrounds.

Question. Well, would the National Service Corps people be working in their own hometown or will you be assigning midwesterners to New York, or New Yorkers to the South?

Mr. HACKETT. Probably they would not work in their hometown, but in other parts of the country.

Question. How would they live?

Mr. HACKETT. They would live in the area in which they go to work. If they worked in a mental hospital, they would live there.

Question. And the Government would pay them enough for their room and board?

Mr. HACKETT. That is right.

Question. And subsistence?

Mr. HACKETT. Yes. We estimate between \$6 and \$8 a day, depending on the area. It would be on a par with the people with whom they are working.

Question. Do you anticipate any opposition in Congress from those Members who might be opposed to having Negroes and whites working together in, say, a depressed southern area?

Mr. HACKETT. I would hope not. The key to the whole thing is that this would be on invitation only. The local community would have to decide whether they would want these corps people.

Question. You wouldn't likely have a corps of volunteers in some parts of Mississippi, would you?

Mr. HACKETT. This would be up to the people in Mississippi. When you are talking about 3,000 to 5,000 people, obviously they can't be everywhere. We would hope that cities or States would set up their own counterparts, and begin to move into similar areas. Many of us live in very comfortable circumstances, and do not know the plight of the migratory worker or the Indian, or the Negro in Harlem. I think that is a role the catalyst is going to play.

Question. Will the Federal Government have any control over these projects?

Mr. HACKETT. I think that there would be some basic criteria established. Then I think the control and supervision would be in the hands of the local community or the agency. There would be no people from Washington telling them what to do. This would be a locally supervised and initiated program. The volunteers would be under local supervision.

Question. What, if any, safeguards are there to prevent the National Service Corps volunteers from being used as political workers at campaign time?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, I would doubt whether an application would get through if this was the intent. It is not anticipated that any of these people would be used as political workers.

Question. Would they be barred from any political activity?

Mr. HACKETT. I think so. I would assume so; yes.

Question. Will those volunteers be permitted to work on projects that are sponsored by religious organizations?

Mr. HACKETT. I think it is a difficult question to answer, but I think it would depend upon the job that the applicant wants to do, regardless of who it is, and the amount of support from the local community.

Question. But there is no flat ban against a project that is inspired by some religious organization?

Mr. HACKETT. It would depend on the project. The intent is not to further an agency's aims or ambitions, but to give service and try to help in these various problem areas.

Question. Would it be permissible for a National Service Corps volunteer assigned, for example, to a migratory worker camp to lobby for improved housing or better schooling or higher pay?

Mr. HACKETT. I doubt whether these people would be sent in to do that. This would be under the complete control of the local community. If they did not follow or behave according to the plan, there would be no question that they would be removed.

DOES FEDERAL AID MEAN FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most persistent fears in the debate over Federal aid to education is the fear of eventual control of education and the imposition of restraints on academic freedom.

Mr. McGeorge Bundy, now special assistant to the President and formerly dean of the faculty at Harvard University, is especially well qualified to discuss this important question.

He has seen Federal aid to education in action from both sides of the fence, and last fall in a speech to the American Council on Education, he said:

I will say flatly that American higher learning is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds.

After pointing out the self-evident fact that Federal support has been extraordinarily productive and helped make possible levels of educational achievement that would have been impossible without Federal assistance, Mr. Bundy makes the point that—

Freedom is the opportunity to act as well as the absence of restraint. Without Federal money our scientists would not have been free, in the most precise sense of the word, to do what they have done in the last 15 years.

He then goes on to make the quite cogent observation that—

Nearly all the money which supports higher education in this country carries with it some risk of limitation upon the freedom of academic life, and the record of the Federal dollar does not suffer by comparison with any other major source of funds. In the best of our institutions, the Federal dollar has been, on the average, as good as any other—always excepting the wholly unrestricted gift. In American academic life as a whole the qualitative rating of Federal money would in my considered conviction be better than that of any other major class of income.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Bundy has given a penetrating speech, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE BLESSING THAT IS FEDERAL AID

(By McGeorge Bundy)

Of propositions which in my judgment have been demonstrated beyond doubt, two are of high importance. The first is that Federal investment in the higher learning has been extraordinarily productive, both for the national security and for the quality of our civilization. The second is that the processes of this investment have on the whole been such as to enhance the freedom and independent strength of American colleges and universities.

The productivity of Federal investment in higher education is probably a notion that needs little demonstration in this audience. Whether we consider the principal immediate objectives of advancing the Nation's defense and improving the Nation's health—or the wider issue of the quality and quantity of American science, we can say quite frankly that without the Federal Government our present levels of achievement would be impossible. This proposition is self-evident to responsible scientists, responsible university administrators, responsible Government officials, and responsible members of leading committees of Congress. Its self-evidence is the primary cause of the very rapid curve of growth in Federal support for science and technology. Within this proposition there can be many questions and reservations, but its essential and sweeping validity is clear.

The second proposition is equally plain, at least in my judgment, but I recognize that it needs more argument. We are so accustomed to a nervous suspicion of "Federal control" that it is not easy to accept the notion that the Federal dollar may in fact be a reinforcement of freedom. So let us look at the facts.

Let me at once recognize that the general proposition is subject to substantial reservations and qualifications. There are many, and there is no better place to become acquainted with them than to serve as dean at a place like Harvard where the faculty has a cantankerous habit of independence. I know about the problem of project support, the problem of paperwork, the problem of the undersupported field of inquiry, the problem of badly designed fellowship or loan programs, the problems of oaths and affidavits, and above all, the problem of the internal hemorrhage which can be created by Federal money which does not meet overhead costs. These are all real problems, and unless he has changed since I used to work for him, President Pusey will have said some sharp things about them earlier.

FEDERAL DOLLARS PRODUCE FREEDOM

But all of these weaknesses can be repaired, and progress is being made on most of them. And neither singly nor in combination do they outbalance the overwhelming positive effects of Federal money. I will say flatly that American higher learning is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds.

There are a number of ways of demonstrating this proposition, but I content myself with three. The first is quite simple: it is that freedom is the opportunity to act as well as the absence of restraint. Without Federal money our scientists would not have been free, in the most precise sense of the word, to do what they have done in the last 15 years. It is no good to talk about academic freedom when antiquated laboratories, inadequate instruments, and overcrowded teaching schedules make serious inquiry impossible. When it is not given under crippling limitations and restrictions, money is quite simply an instrument of freedom, in the universities as elsewhere in life. This is a point so obvious that we frequently forget it.

My second supporting argument is comparative in form. My claim is simply that nearly all the money which supports higher education in this country carries with it some risk of limitation upon the freedom of academic life, and that the record of the Federal dollar does not suffer by comparison with any other major source of funds.

All of us know that the national academic budget, on the income side, is a many-colored mixture of funds from a wide variety of sources: from tuition, from legislative appropriations, from annual gifts, from endowments, from contracts, from foundations, from Government, from alumni, from church and state, from industry and individuals. We also know, although we don't always admit it, that almost every one of these sources of funds carries with it the hazard that it may limit our freedom of action. It is a standard pleasantry in our private gatherings that members of public universities should speak in envious tones to their colleagues in private colleges of the beauty of life without a State legislature to placate, and when this joke is trotted out the man from the private college is likely to reply by offering to match his five most critical alumni against any legislative committee in the country. All of us here know that suspicion of the principles of academic freedom is endemic among legislatures and alumni. It is endemic—seldom dominant, but always present—and the freedom of American higher learning as a whole cannot be measured by the unusual independence of action of a few colleges and universities with strong traditions.

FEDERAL GRANTS BEYOND CRITICISM

Even when we leave aside the cruder forms of attack upon freedom of inquiry, there is little reason to single out the Federal dollar for criticism. An unbalanced allocation of resources is more characteristic of alumni than of Government agencies, and the over-administered grant was invented by the large private foundations long before the Government became a significant force in academic life. Indeed, my own experience as an academic administrator leads me to the view that on balance the Federal Government makes its grants and signs its contracts with a better perception of the real needs of the higher learning than one can find, on the average, in the major private foundations.

When we look at the overall pattern of higher education, the record of the Federal dollar is still less open to comparative attack. The Federal dollar has not been used, as State dollars have been, to support whole departments and majors in subjects that don't belong at the college or university level. The Federal dollar has not been used, as private gifts have been, for overly luxurious athletic facilities that are reminiscent more of the country club than of the academy. The Federal dollar has not been used for the subsidy of athletes or the construction of pretentious and egocentric memorial buildings. In the best of our institutions, the Federal dollar has been, on the average, as good as any other—always excepting the wholly unrestricted gift. In American academic life as a whole the qualitative rating of Federal money would in my considered conviction be better than that of any other major class of income.

My third claim for the quality of Federal money is that the decisions by which it is allocated are made by processes more nearly fitted to the great tradition of academic life than is the case with any other major source of funds. Within the broad lines of authorizations laid down by statute, what governs the decisions of the Federal Government on the whole is the collective judgment of outstanding members of the academic community itself. Statutory provisions may not be perfect, but the Congress has encouraged intelligent administrative interpretation, and

in practice the qualitative performance of Federal money has been set by the judgment and taste of Federal administrators in seeking and using the counsel of qualified academic men. On balance that judgment has been excellent.

I emphasize this point because it is one of cardinal importance for the future of relations between government and universities. The greatest single safeguard for this relationship is the interplay of thought and decision of large numbers of individuals with proper professional qualifications on both sides of the line. This principle is embodied historically in the statute which established the National Academy of Sciences. It was followed in practice during the extraordinary events of the Second World War, when the Federal Government and the academic community first worked at full pressure together. This is a meeting of academic administrators and as a former member of that club I recognize and even share the feeling many of you must have, that real wisdom and judgment in academic budgeting belongs to the president, or at least to the dean. The institution in which I myself was an administrator has a tradition of quite highhanded and centralized executive behavior—and it has not suffered, on balance, as a consequence. Yet the fact is, and we all know this too, that executive energy in academic administration always depends for its effectiveness on a most intensive process of consultation and consensus. Our colleges and universities serve best when they serve in their own way, under processes that meet their own requirements. The most serious mistake a lay granting body can make is to try to decide for itself how a given objective can be met by academic institutions. In some statutory provisions and in some administrative practices the Federal Government has certainly made this mistake—but—again on balance—its major granting agencies have followed a very different and much more constructive course.

ABANDON FEAR OF FEDERAL AID

Assuming that you are not in violent revolt against the argument so far, we now have two propositions: First, Federal money has repaid its cost production in most important ways; second, it has been a reinforcement of the freedom of the higher learning. From these conclusions it should follow that the traditional fear and hostility to Federal aid to higher education would be abandoned—and certainly there has been some progress in this direction. The anguished prophecies of earlier decades are heard less often—and from less respectable sources. One incidental benefit has been that representatives of private colleges, as their annual accounts begin to show large admixtures of Federal money, have somewhat muted the warnings against the low standards and political pressure of public institutions with which they have too often sought to attract private funds.

But much remains to be done. Too much of our time is still spent—even in speeches like this one—in arguing a case which, at least among ourselves, we should have learned to take for granted. Too many of us are acting still as if Federal participation in the higher learning were still an uncertain experiment, instead of the stable and growing reality which it is. And this is what I mean by my somewhat foolish title: 'generalized hostility to Federal money is as senseless as tilting at a windmill. The windmill is here to stay, and it is no man's enemy. Indeed this whole business of Federal money in higher education represents a constructive partnership which benefits both sides—and I will press my title just a bit further—to suggest that the analogy of

the windmill can be applied in two quite contrasting ways, both of them fitting to the case.

A windmill, as you know, and as Don Quixote did not, is a peaceful agency for making wind do work. The wind may blow from many directions, but a well-designed windmill gets results in terms of grain ground. So it is with a well-designed university. It exists to advance learning and the winds of financial support—whatever their course—are caught and turned to the university's purpose. So it is also with a soundly conceived program of Federal aid: Such a program also can be seen as a windmill—in which the university's winnowing breezes provide the force that serves the program's purpose. The analogies are labored, I fear—but in this clumsy way they both hold true. This is what has been demonstrated conclusively in the last 20 years—and this is what we must take for granted as we examine the real issues of the present and future.

But what we take for granted we should also never fail to preach. Nothing is plainer about the partnership between Government and the higher learning than the simple fact that most Americans are deeply unaware of it. That is not a healthy situation, for over the long run we will not, as citizens, support with taxes what we do not understand. This is not the place for a study of the unusual pattern of circumstance, which has produced the curious present situation—there is nothing discreditable about it—nor has it been done in any secretive way. The people's Representatives in Congress have followed the whole process closely—and for those who have followed it closely this has been a fine example of responsible government in action. But the ordinary citizen really has not followed it at all, and in the universities and colleges we have not done nearly enough to tell him about it. This is a mistake, for in the American governmental process it is the immediate beneficiary of Federal activity whose job it is to assure public understanding that the benefits he receives are in the public interest. It is not enough to persuade ourselves, in private discussion, that the help we get is deeply in the public interest. The taxpayer deserves explanation, acknowledgment, and thanks. He has every right to an understanding pride in the degree to which he is himself a partner in one of the most productive and effective activities in all our great society, and if he does not feel that pride, the fault is ours.

The partnership exists; it is productive; it needs our energetic and continuous defense. So far so good. But what can we do to improve it? Each of us I am sure can think of a dozen immediate and concrete answers to that question—but let me offer instead a few more general comments.

First, I think we need to give constant attention to all the multiplicity of details which affect our relationship. It is all well and good to make sweeping statements such as those I have already offered, but these statements stand or fall on what is actually done in a hundred different programs. The Government, most fortunately, presents not one but many faces to the university world, and if at any given moment the best face is very beautiful, the worst is likely to be quite a mess—and it may even have effects like those of Medusa. Law by law, program by program, office by office, and even case by case we must ourselves police the partnership. I have already indicated my belief that a critically important role in these matters belongs to the qualified scholars in each relevant field, but you who are responsible to the wider public, as heads of institutions, cannot safely leave this labor to your scholars alone. The same hazards and necessities which justify alert and active central administration within our universities demand your attention in the relation

between your institution and the Government: Cliques can form in the process of counsel to Washington as readily as in a closed and self-satisfied university department. And the intrusion of unhealthy influence from the donor is not always resisted by professors with special interests; like bad alumni and misguided legislatures, Washington bureaucrats require the vigilance of administrations as well as faculties. I will remember myself, from my years at Harvard, how often along the battleground of negotiation with Government agencies it was the quite un scholarly administrative officer in charge of contracts, and not the high-minded and learned professor in search of funds, who maintained the true principles of academic autonomy. And on the rare, but real, occasion in which Federal assistance becomes excessively generous, it is unfortunately very unlikely that the immediate beneficiaries will complain. Someone else should, and I think administrators are nominated.

Our responsibility is still more clear in a second field: The prevention—or repair—of imbalances in American learning which may be created—quite unintentionally—by Federal programs. I am not an alarmist on this point—there are very learned men whom I hold in great affection who seem to me just plain wrong in their fear of the rise of science. Nevertheless it seems certain to me that the general welfare does require us to be watchful against distortions. And my own conviction is that the best single remedy is to seek for ways of gradually expanding the flow of Federal money so that it works for the reinforcement of the higher learning as a whole. This can be done, I believe, without any loss of effectiveness in meeting the particular and legitimately urgent purposes which have inspired existing programs. But we will have to help.

To do this job and others, I believe, we will have to show, individually and collectively, a new level of attention to this whole problem. So my third recommendation is that we must do much more, in the future, in our Washington work. Until now, you know, the Federal dollar has been badly underprivileged in its share of attention from high-level academic administrators. To put it quite bluntly, most of us have simply let the money roll in, contenting ourselves from time to time with well bred complaints about bureaucrats or less well bred sneers when too much money seemed to be going to someone else. We are beginning to do better, but there is a lot still to be done.

And that brings me to my last and most important point. The case for higher education—and for its partnership with the Federal Government—is not merely a matter of our common interest in technical progress, or in the national defense, or in medical research. It is not merely a matter of the evident need for improved facilities, the obligation to open doors for young people, or the honorable race for space. It is not even a matter merely of the health and strength of the higher learning as a whole. What is going on here is a great adventure in the purpose and performance of a free people. We have built great private institutions—small and large. We have developed magnificent State universities, and we are going to have more of them. In the last 20 years it has become plain that this whole vast enterprise requires—and is required for—the interest of the Nation as a whole. This is a cause for care, and for attention to detail, for new organization and effort, for explanation and for advocacy. But it is also a cause for pride and hope. For what has been accomplished so far proves beyond doubt that there is good for all America in this new partnership. Surely it is our responsibility—and our urgent duty—to see to it that what is done continues to be good—gets better—that what needs to be done gets

¹ "Of Winds and Windmills: Free Universities and Public Policy."—Editor.

more and wider understanding—and that the larger meaning of this high achievement of our Federal democracy is understood and recognized. This great chapter of accomplishment, properly understood and properly sustained, can be a major reinforcement to our whole society—as a demonstration of effective action for high purposes. It is time for us to speak and work a whole lot harder to this end, so that the winds may blow, the windmills work—and all of us be proud.

PROBLEMS OF URBAN GROWTH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are all pretty much aware of the tremendous population growth and changes that are taking place in the major metropolitan areas of the country, but we have badly ignored the problems that have arisen and neglected ways of coping with them, so that we might achieve the best possible living environment for the vast majority of the American people who are urban and suburban dwellers.

A most interesting article on this subject recently appeared in the *Jersey Journal*, February 4, written by Dr. Stanley Worton, of Jersey City State College.

After describing the implications of downtown deterioration, suburban sprawl, and traffic congestion, Dr. Worton suggests that our metropolitan areas consider reviving "the old natural corridor-type development that came with the railroads in the last century" as a way of shaping a more satisfying environment for all.

While obviously no one solution will meet the almost infinite variety of needs and desires of our urban areas across the country, this pattern of development certainly warrants very careful study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

A BROADER REGIONAL APPROACH WILL HELP SOLVE URBAN BLIGHT—JCSC PROFESSOR CONSIDERS "SPREAD CITY" PROBLEM

(By Dr. Stanley N. Worton)

The bulldozers are busy. The countryside is being subdivided into larger and larger plots for ranch-style, split-level, and colonial homes. Shopping centers are springing up like mushrooms. Industry is spreading out in all directions along the highways or on scattered sites.

Meanwhile, urban blight continues to spread. The problems of congestion, dirt, noise, air pollution, and lack of parking and play space are on the increase. There is an exodus from the older cities of families with children.

Does this mean that the great metropolis of which we are a part is on the way out, fated to extinction like the dinosaur or the dodo bird?

Will the entire region soon become a sprawling mass of continuous residential and industrial development without 1 inch of open space?

Will our central cities be left to the old couples, the single people, the wealthy, the very poor, and to minority groups who are not welcome elsewhere?

The answer to all these questions must be an emphatic "No."

The New York metropolitan area is the greatest region in the Nation, if not in the

entire world. It is unsurpassed as a center of industry, commerce and finance, of entertainment and culture, of education, and, yes, of living as well.

More than 16 million persons—1 out of every 11 Americans—live here. They inhabit 22 counties in 3 States; 9 of the counties—our own Hudson is 1 of them—are in New Jersey.

How can this region change the direction of its development and avoid its fate? It can do so only when we the people who live and work in it recognize what will be happening to us and then decide to do something about it.

But first we must see how we got to be the way we are.

Basic to any human settlement are the opportunities for jobs present in the area. The New York metropolitan region got its start as a port of entry for people and for goods. It continued to grow, not only because it developed into a great port, but because of the forms of economic activity that developed out of its role in commerce.

In addition to light and heavy industry and all forms of transport, there are concentrated here the financial community, the printing trades, advertising, public relations, and management experts, designers, wholesale and retail centers, nonprofit corporations and foundations, health and welfare leadership, cultural and entertainment facilities, and a host of specialized services.

Such an economic mix requires a tremendous reservoir of manpower, skills, and talent. The residents of this region provide these qualities to a degree unmatched anywhere in the world.

So concentrated are the enterprises involved that one-third of the more than 6½ million jobs are in lower Manhattan. Another one-third are in the harbor band—the rest of the core area—in cities like Jersey City, Bayonne, Kearny, Hoboken, Weehawken, Union City, West New York, and North Bergen. One-fifth are in the inner ring of suburbs, and the remainder in the outer ring, or hinterland.

However, in recent years there has been an outward movement of jobs. The trend has been to go suburban. Industry has found that the time factor is more important than the distance factor and it has been locating along the highways or in industrial parks. Here they establish themselves on large tracts of land in sprawling, one-story plants with plenty of parking space. Acreage is cheap and taxes are low—at first.

The movement to the suburbs got its start at the end of World War II because of the pent-up demand for housing and the fact that it was cheaper to buy a house in the suburbs under a veterans' or FHA mortgage than to rent an apartment in the city.

But it was more than just a matter of economics. Suburbia became a form of status and a choice of a way of life—open space, grass and trees, a big backyard, community life, small local government, good schools, and low taxes.

Many of those who rushed into suburban life soon found that although each had more space in his backyard, he also had space to cover to reach his destination—the job, stores, and other facilities. Hence the two-car family and the need to chauffeur the children around from activity to activity. As more people moved to the suburbs, the countryside was pushed farther and farther away. In addition, the price tags on homes rose rapidly.

With the need for more schools, sidewalks, sewers, and new services, taxes shot sky-high. Taking care of home and lawn became almost a second job. Direct personal contacts proved to be no more effective in influencing local government than the energetic civic organization with know-how in the city.

If this is the way things are now, what does the future hold for us? What will the

metropolitan region be like 25 years from now?

The Regional Plan Association, a non-profit civic organization engaged in research on the development of the metropolitan area, has made a number of projections on the region's growth. It is estimated that by 1985 the population of the 22-county area will increase from 16 million to 22 million, an addition equal to the present populations of Chicago and Philadelphia combined. The increase will be the largest of any 25-year period in our history, even including the years of heavy immigration early in the century.

As for the kind of residential development that is taking place outside our cities and will continue to develop if present trends continue, Regional Plan Association has coined a phrase to describe it: "spread-city."

It is a sparsely settled, homogenized Los Angeles. It is not a true city because it lacks centers. It is not a suburb because it is not attached to a central city. Nor is it truly rural, for it is loosely covered with houses and urban facilities.

There will be no "downtown" where shops, restaurants, movies, and specialized services are concentrated. The pulse and excitement, the variety, the culture that has attracted man to the city throughout history will be gone.

The effects of spread-city will not be felt only by those who live in it, but by all the inhabitants of the metropolitan region. Traffic congestion and travel time will continue to mount. Although factories may move farther out in the hinterland, their workers will not follow because they won't be able to afford the new one-family houses on large lots. It will be the executive-professional classes who will move out, but their jobs will continue to be in the core areas. This will result in a form of reverse commuting.

As Mason Gross, president of Rutgers University, has so aptly put it: "The greatest evil that we face is not the slum or even the inextricable traffic jam, but rather an emptiness or meaninglessness of our day-to-day existence. A tremendous amount of time which could be lived through and enjoyed has been thrown carelessly away on utterly meaningless experiences—most of them behind the wheel of the automobile. I suggest to you further that meaninglessness is a malignant disease. If we allow it to feed on 2 hours of our day, it will soon begin to spread to the rest."

What is bringing about the development of spread-city? Do the people of the metropolitan region prefer this mode of living? If we can find a cause, perhaps a solution will follow.

The answers to these questions can be found in the fact that the vacant land now being subdivided for housing is zoned at an average of two-thirds of an acre for a one-family house. This land is found in about 200 towns in the metropolitan area with an average population of 10,000 each.

The main reason for this policy is local taxes. Bigger lots mean fewer houses, fewer houses mean less families and fewer children, fewer children means fewer schools, fewer schools mean less taxes. Apartment building and industry would help, but they cause a loss of prestige.

What is at the heart of the problem, then, is the best use of land—new land to be developed and the reuse of old land.

A workable solution to the problems of the region already exists. What needs to be done is to revive the old natural corridor-type of development that came with the railroads in the last century. As the railroads fanned out in different directions from the major cities into the countryside, towns sprang up along the way spaced like beads on a chain. If this pattern were repeated again, we would have commercial centers and industrial

clusters springing up around train stations and highway interchanges. Here, too, would be most of the apartment houses. Spreading out from these centers probably would be garden apartments and attached houses; further out would be one-family houses on small lots; still further one-family houses on large lots.

The alternative to building the region around exclusive automobile travel would be investment in a much faster and cheaper commuter rail service. The railroads are losing money on their commuter lines and seem most willing to abandon them. A public agency could supervise the region's rail network as a whole and fit it to total needs. It could set standards and fares and provide higher speed, up-to-date equipment, frequent service, and more convenient stops and transfers.

A loop system or network of rapid transit facilities connecting cities and inner suburbs and in turn linked to the outer towns by express buses or existing rail lines would provide a logical pattern for the industrial and residential development of the future. A start has been made with the port authority's takeover of the Hudson and Manhattan lines. But this is just a beginning.

All these programs would have a direct effect upon improving the core cities. But specific action must also be taken along the following lines to make urban life more attractive:

1. Dramatically increase State aid for low- and middle-income housing and for improved schools.

2. Revamp taxation so that high-rise apartment houses (the potential slums of tomorrow) are not the sole form of urban renewal. Congestion is bad for family life.

3. Encourage individual home improvement; do not discourage it by penalizing the owner with a higher assessment when he makes improvements.

4. Spread public housing into the suburbs, rather than raise the density of the core cities.

5. Recognize that a city is more than just a mass of buildings. Families, especially new arrivals, need training and education in group living and civic responsibility.

6. Allow minority groups, whose purchasing power has risen meteorically in recent years, to make their contribution to urban living.

No metropolitan area in the world can offer more than this one. Whether we allow it to get out of joint or make use of the technology and planning at our disposal to improve conditions depends on how many people care and how much they care.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, were it not for the fact that it comes 10 years too late, I would be most gratified by the unprecedented interest expressed in this body in the conduct of our foreign relations with Latin America—particularly Cuba—and our newly developed attention to the political and economic conditions existing on that continent.

PRESENT INTEREST IN CUBA

There used to be whole weeks, indeed months, when no word concerning the aspirations and needs of our Latin neighbors was spoken in the Congress. Sometimes years would go by without any tangible action being taken by this body to alleviate the problems in Latin America, or to enable those people to better solve their own problems. Latin America was not in vogue then. Headlines proclaiming what a prominent American statesman or ordinary Member of Con-

gress said about South America did not come easily in those days. Now it seems the whole Nation, including those—or perhaps I should say especially those—who were most quiet then talk of little but the southern continent. There has been a change in interest and focus. What brought about the change? It was the admission of Communist adherence by a man, named Fidel Castro, who followed the typical pattern of shouting for liberty and democracy, while totally crushing the Cuban people and burying their once bright aspirations for a better life in an improved democracy.

I hope that after the present danger exemplified by Castro's Cuba has ceased to exist—and one day it will, for I fully believe the Cubans will again one day be free—our interest in the welfare of our Latin neighbors will continue.

I hope that we will not quickly forget these dangerous and unhappy days, but will forever be mindful that our own Nation's security and well-being are inextricably bound up with that of Cuba and our Latin neighbors to the south.

One of my deepest convictions is that in today's world, where jet-powered airplanes, missiles, and rocketry pull us ever closer physically, our dependence on and need for each other grow proportionately. The two continents of this Western Hemisphere are indissolubly bound together. Like the legendary Siamese twins, one cannot maintain a viable existence without the other. Recognition of this fact by the Congress is a necessary step in insuring that our own Nation's future remains economically and politically secure.

SMATHERS' LONG-STANDING INTEREST IN LATIN AMERICA

It was with this in mind that, over the past 12 years, I spoke more than 170 times in the Senate—sometimes briefly, often at length—trying to call attention to the progressive deterioration in our relations with Latin America from that time in World War II, when we collaborated closely with them in joint efforts to stop the Nazis.

I recall, shortly after reaching the Senate in 1951, warning, I believe in my first speech on this Senate floor of our indifference to our Latin neighbors, and urging our Government to increase its economic assistance to the countries of Central and South America. When the Foreign Relations Committee in August of that year proposed to reduce even the small amount of technical assistance proposed by the administration for Latin America, I told the Senate:

It seems to me that we must not lose sight of our own security, which means of course the well-being and welfare of the entire Western Hemisphere. Above all, we should remember who our friends are. One of the great errors for us to make would be to forget these people who not only are in our own neighborhood, but with whom we have had friendly and beneficial relations for many years.

In July 1954, in another effort to direct our thinking southward, I warned of the Communist threat in that area by saying: "We must assist the anti-Communist forces in Latin America to eliminate the conditions of poverty and

illiteracy in which the seeds of communism blossom and flourish. The time for action is now."

With administration and congressional apathy continuing, I declared in June 1956, that "today the Soviet Union is moving into Latin America in an attempt to fill the vacuum we have left there."

Our national leaders in those days were apparently acting on the premise that the good neighbor policy, enunciated and started in the mid-1930's, would somehow work in the 1950's, even though we as a nation did no more about it than, from time to time, make a speech calculated to assuage their feelings, but nothing more.

And so, while the United States with generosity and good will unparalleled in world history granted or loaned over \$85 billion to foreign countries around the globe during the years 1947-60, the 21 nations of Latin America—our neighbors, our friends, with 180 million people and with the fastest growing population on the face of the globe—received on the average less than one-fourth of 1 percent of this \$85 billion total.

FIDEL CASTRO COMES TO POWER

Fidel Castro's coming to power in January 1959 was the beginning of the change in attitude.

We all remember that in the early months of 1959 Castro was the most heroic figure in all the hemisphere in the eyes of the general public. He was the modern Robin Hood, or, more appropriately, a Cuban "Zapata," the legendary hill fighter who fought always against tyranny.

Here was that type of man, it was said, who could revitalize the Latin American nations, who could and would throw off the shackles of inequity and oppression, who would give the people dignity and self-respect, who could operate a government like our own—one of, by, and for the people.

However, Mr. President, there were some of us who never believed this propaganda.

On January 17, 1959, 2 weeks after he came into power, I stated on a television program:

I reserve judgment on the quality of his (Castro's) ambition, his capacity to administer the affairs of Cuba, his understanding of democracy and his judgment and tolerance.

I questioned if "the people of Cuba have improved their position by merely the change of governments."

These were unhappy and unpleasant days for me—unhappy because I saw communism taking a foothold in the Caribbean with the unwitting assistance and unstinting applause of many here in our own country; unpleasant because my opposition to Castro won for me the disapproval of not only a large portion of my constituents, but virtually all of the press.

During the first week in January 1959, following Batista's flight but before Castro had completed his triumphal march from the Sierra Maestra, I was so concerned about this youthful Caesar, and the danger he constituted to his own

people and to the hemisphere, that I made special calls to Assistant Secretary of State Roy Rubottom. I urged him, and subsequently Secretary of State Herter, not to recognize any government set up by Castro until that government had held at least one free election.

I shall never forget being advised by Mr. Rubottom that the American public demanded recognition of Castro's regime, and this recognition was blithely given on January 7. My records reflect that 2 days later, on January 9, Mr. Rubottom and I had further discussion about Castro in my office, and on January 11 I met with a State Department delegation in still further discussion of the subject of Castro, communism, and Cuba. However, the act had been done and frankly met with overwhelming approval.

I took a trip around Central and South America from January 19 until February 10, 1959, and wherever I went in my talks with labor leaders, clergymen, government officials, and others, there was quiet but nonetheless great apprehension as to the quality of Castro's intentions.

I remember well my personal dismay when Castro was invited to address the American Society of Newspaper Editors here in Washington in April 1959. I recall that he subsequently was invited and did appear before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

The chairman was kind enough to invite me to listen in, and I particularly remember the general warmth with which Fidel Castro was received. I endeavored to ask him a few questions, but had little success as he realized I had some doubts about him. When I kept asking him when he was going to have an election, I recall he responded that "the people of Cuba don't want an election." When I pressed him further on the question of elections, he said, "I might have one in 3 or 4 years."

Despite his ominous statements, support for him was so overwhelming that I began to have doubt in my own judgment about this man.

According to my files, that very day after his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee, I stated in a written press release that—

Serious trouble is brewing in the Caribbean area. The source of danger is centered in Cuba, a country which historically has always been our friend. Cuba could easily become a prisoner of the Reds. Fidel Castro, during a meeting today with several Senators, told me that elections in Cuba were 3 or 4 years away. That is not very heartening news. I asked him about his anti-American statements and he denied having made them.

I went on to say:

It is clear that he has not yet learned you can't play ball with the Communists for he has them peppered throughout his government.

In early April 1959, even more disturbing news began to come. Because I had expressed doubt about Castro, others who had doubt began to call me about their concern. I received two cablegrams from the President of Haiti expressing fear over an anticipated inva-

sion from Cuba. I came to the Senate floor and stated:

The President of Haiti appealed to me for help by cablegram to help forestall an invasion of his country. I sent today, April 17, 1959, a telegram to Dr. Jose Mora, Secretary-General of the OAS, urging that he take immediate action to set up a voluntary police force to keep the peace in Latin America. I suggested this police patrol be made up of the 21 member states of the OAS including the United States. We have to relieve tension in the Caribbean and put a halt to Communist troublemaking. An inter-American police force could do the job but we don't have much time to act.

It was shortly after this warning of April 17, specifically on April 24, that Castro sent against the Republic of Panama an invasion force that he had permitted to be organized and trained in Cuba. Even after this act of aggression, I don't recall any concern having been expressed by any of the Senators or news commentators who are so loudly and persistently talking today. I do recall the late Senator from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges, talking about the danger of Fidel Castro to Central and South America, and all he got for his trouble was criticism.

However, there began to be some ripple of criticism of Castro in May of 1959 when he confiscated the property and assets of 117 companies, the bulk of which were American-owned. I recall at that time making a statement to the press and on television that we should not sit idly by—that the confiscation of American property should not be ignored and that immediate and effective steps should be taken to stop it.

A month later, in June 1959, the State Department began for the first time to express some concern about Castro's acts and specifically about the need of having adequate compensation paid to those Americans who had lost their property.

On May 26, 1959, I offered, on the floor of the Senate, amendments to the Mutual Security Act which were designed to create an Inter-American Police Force, and Inter-American Court of Justice. No action was taken by the committee to which referred.

On the 31st of May 1959, after Fidel Castro and his Communist cohorts had, through executions and the use of raw power, subdued all resistance in Cuba, he again turned his eyes toward new conquests and launched an invasion of the country of Nicaragua.

That invasion was successfully turned back and incontrovertible evidence was obtained by the defenders of Nicaragua, proving beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the invasion had been financed, organized, and launched by Castro from the Island of Cuba. So far as I have been able to ascertain there was no protest or outcry about the invasion of Nicaragua by the State Department or anyone else in position of authority.

I again emphasize that there were very few people in that particular time, the summer of 1959, who were interested in clipping the wings of Fidel Castro.

He still had the bulk of the American people's support. He still had many newsmen lyrically writing about him as a great revolutionary, despite the fact that

his drumhead courts-martial had executed close to 600 of his fellow countrymen—including some who had fought alongside him in the hills against Batista—and despite the fact that he had completely flouted the rights of U.S. citizens and property owners and had launched invasions of Panama and Nicaragua.

On June 14 and June 20, 1959, invasion forces organized in Cuba were directed against Santo Domingo. These were stopped and, from the sketchy reports, it appeared that every member of that expeditionary force from Cuba was exterminated. Once again, sufficient evidence was recovered from the bodies of the invaders to establish that these forces were sent on their mission by Fidel Castro and the Communists.

On October 13, 1959, the little country of Haiti was invaded, again by forces from the Island of Cuba, and again under the direction of Castro's Communists. This invasion was again defeated by Haitians who had been trained in military tactics by a detachment of 50 U.S. Marines.

On October 26 Castro, becoming ever more arrogant and contemptible in his conduct toward the United States and his neighbors in this hemisphere, and feeling ever more secure in his relationship with the Communists, accused the United States of aggression.

He reestablished his drumhead military courts and began to summarily execute political prisoners without recognition of any of the elementary personal rights whatsoever. As of this date it was estimated the Castro regime had executed over 500 people. Later the total was to reach well over 1,000.

In January 1960 and through the early part of February I made another trip to the Central and South American countries and upon my return I outlined in a Senate speech on February 24 an eight-point program calculated to limit the activities of Castro's Communists in Central and South America.

Among other things, I asked that we turn over to the OAS all the information which the FBI, CIA, and our other intelligence agencies had in their files on communism in Cuba and Castro's connection with it.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover had at this time—and long before—a dossier on Castro and his Communist connections that should have convinced the most ardent fan of Castro in the State Department, of his allegiance to communism, but I doubt if they ever asked for this information or saw it.

In that speech, I urged the United States to urge the OAS to act. I said the United States should not act unilaterally. I suggested that the OAS should examine the possibility of imposing economic sanctions on Cuba. I also said that "Castro has now identified himself for what he is—a man who, if not himself a Communist, is certainly doing the work of the Communists with the direct help of the Communists."

On March 5, 1960, Castro accused the United States of complicity in the explosion of a munitions ship in the Havana Harbor which killed hundreds of people.

On March 25 in a TV interview I said "I deeply regret the administration's return of Ambassador Bonsal to Cuba" from where he had been withdrawn on January 21, and I pointed out that this move would be mistaken by the people of Latin America.

I had visited in my office with Ambassador Bonsal prior to his return. I suggested to him that he not return, arguing that it would appear in the minds of many of our friends in Latin America that, in fact, we wanted to see the government of Fidel Castro succeed and that his action would be interpreted as endorsement of Castro's actions. Bonsal said the decision was not his to make.

Again I took the matter up with the State Department and other officials without any success, for Ambassador Bonsal was returned.

It was because of this action that I said in the television interview mentioned above, that "even though we claim in our press and elsewhere about our desire to get rid of dictators, it would appear that we are standing behind this dictator."

At this particular time I recall distinctly having a visit with Secretary Christian Herter, for whom I personally have great affection and respect, and asking him to withdraw Mr. Bonsal for the second time as Ambassador to Cuba.

I pointed out that "Che" Guevara, who was at that time the head of the National Bank of Cuba, in a recent speech in Havana had five times said that the Soviet Union was the best friend Cuba ever had.

None of my warnings seemed to convince anyone. Shortly thereafter in a TV program I said:

For many, many years this administration has talked about the appeasement they thought had gone on in the Far East and other areas of the globe—they made a great to-do about the statement that they would under no conditions appease—that they would stand strong in the face of the Communist movement. But in this particular instance I think we have some sickening appeasement.

On April 7, 1960, I made another general speech on the floor of the Senate in which I recommended a six-point program to strengthen ties between the United States and Latin America.

On May 23, 1960, Castro seized U.S. oil refineries and said they would be required in order to process Russian crude oil.

On May 27, 1960, the U.S. State Department announced that the U.S. economic aid program to Cuba, which had been running between \$150,000 and \$200,000 a year, would be terminated on December 1, 1960.

It was further announced that the U.S. military aid which was at that time consisting of training Cuban air cadets in Texas would be terminated in June of 1960.

I praised President Eisenhower on this action and I said:

I am glad that the President has now taken a realistic and sensible position with respect to the Communist-dominated Castro government. It has never made sense to me to have our Government giving aid and com-

fort to another government which is openly vilifying us and our way of life.

I went on to say that—

I hope that those who have up to now sought a continuation of a very partial and preferential sugar legislation as it pertains to Cuba will be willing to reevaluate their position to revise the legislation in a realistic and up-to-date manner.

Shortly thereafter on May 28, 1960, I introduced a bill revoking Cuba's preferential sugar quota and distributing it to five friendly Latin-American countries which never up to that time shared in the U.S. sugar market.

I said:

We are permitting Cuba to sell into the United States over 3 million tons of sugar on which we are giving her a premium price of over 6 cents per pound—3 cents over the world price. This means Cuba gets \$390 million a year from the U.S. housewife. That money, I presume, would be used to further entrench the pro-Communist government and propagandize the Cuban people against the United States and for the Soviet Union.

On June 11, 1960, Castro seized U.S. owned Havana Hotel and Nacional Hotel.

On June 30, 1960, on the floor of the Senate, I urged the establishment again of the hemisphere police force to preserve the peace and security of this hemisphere against the menace of communism and also expressed support of the administration's protest to the OAS of Castro's campaign of lies and slander against the United States.

On July 13, 1960, I again urged the recall of our Ambassador Bonsal and reaffirmation of our treaty rights to Guantanamo Bay, and the placing of the case of Cuba and its control by the Communists before the OAS.

On August 10, 1960, in a public statement, I urged U.S. agencies, particularly the border patrol—Immigration and Naturalization Service—to cease harassing Cuban exiles operating from Florida in their efforts to open lines of communication with democratic forces inside Cuba.

On August 12, 1960, I wrote a letter to President Eisenhower in which I proposed that consideration be given to withdrawing preferential tariff treatment to the Cuban Government in connection with all imports, particularly with respect to sugar, fruit, and vegetables.

I also suggested that the United States impound payments for any commodities received from Cuba and hold until such times as concessions were made with respect to U.S. interests, since Castro had seen fit to prevent American dollars paid for U.S. commodities sold in Cuba from getting out of the country.

On August 31, 1960, after the close of the conference of the OAS in San Jose, Costa Rica, I issued a statement in which I criticized strongly the State Department's support of the watered-down, milk-toast, slap-on-the-wrist type of condemnation of international Communists.

It will be remembered that even with Secretary Herter as our representative at that meeting, the conference did not have the forthrightness to mention the name of Fidel Castro or the Communist government of Cuba. I called it then,

"a diplomatic defeat of the first magnitude."

On the floor of the Senate I noted that the San Jose Conference called for the overthrow of the government of Trujillo but refused even to mention the government of Fidel Castro. I went on to say that the Dominican government "is a government we surely do not approve of; its leadership is undemocratic and dictatorial"; but I asked, "Is there any doubt concerning the real threat to our freedom today?" "It, of course, is communism, and where is the fountainhead of international communism in Latin America today? Not in the Dominican Republic, but in the Communist government of Fidel Castro, and every informed person knows it, and most will admit it."

I asked in that speech:

Who is it in the State Department or in the administration who believes that the 30-year-old government of the Dominican Republic is a greater threat to the freedom of the Western Hemisphere than the Communist government of Cuba?

Who is it that really believes that the government of the Dominican Republic needed to be ostracized and expelled, but that the government of Cuba should go along threatening freedom without even so much as a verbal spanking?

In that speech I said that—

The administration has failed in its leadership because it was unable to cause our friends in the hemisphere to see the difference between an ancient, static, expiring, nonexportable dictatorship and a new, inflammatory, virulent, belligerent, expanding military dictatorship of the Communist variety that is working hand in glove with Khrushchev and Red China.

I asked, "Can fairminded men call this result a great victory?" "I warn my friends in Latin America that Castro's communism aims to destroy them."

I closed the speech by saying:

We must stop deluding our friends in Latin America and stop deceiving ourselves into a sense of false security by adopting pious declarations, which dismay the Communists not at all. We stand on the thin edge of disaster. This is no place for the timorous. This is no time for listening to those who do not realize or refuse to admit we are now in the throes of a tremendous struggle between the free world and the Communist world.

We must stop penalizing those nations who have befriended us. We must take our position as firmly and defiantly as the Communists have taken theirs—and we must encourage every nation and all peoples everywhere to take their stand with us and make their choice for freedom now—or the world will have no choice at all.

On September 21, 1960, I again called on the Government to bring Ambassador Bonsal home; I asked it to ban shipments to Cuba of U.S. machinery or equipment or replacement parts, and to start increasing our long-range broadcasts from the United States to Cuba.

On November 15, 1960, I urged Secretary Herter to call for a plenary session of the OAS to investigate the threat of Castro's communism to this hemisphere and for the United States to assume the leadership for the formation of an Inter-American Police Force.

On January 7, 1961, I wrote a letter to outgoing Secretary Herter and incoming Secretary of State Dean Rusk

urging the banning of all Cuban imports to the United States in order to put an economic squeeze on Castro's government and try to bring it down. There was criticism of this by some Florida industries who depended upon Cuban products, but I felt the situation called for such action.

On February 15, 1961, after the change of administration, in another speech on the Senate floor, I said:

The time has come for action in the Cuban situation. We should adopt an economic embargo calculated to bring Castro to his knees and the Cuban people to freedom.

BAY OF PIGS

On April 17, 1961, we remember, less than 4 months after this administration had come into office, an attack was launched by a group of 1,500 Cubans who had been trained in the far reaches of Guatemala under the supervision of military experts recruited in the United States.

This plan for the invasion at the Bay of Pigs had not been some new development of the new administration because we know that, as a matter of fact, these men were gathered together and sent to Guatemala for training in 1960, before the change of administration.

From my own personal knowledge I know that these men had been held and trained for so long a time in Guatemala and other Central American countries that most of them had become discouraged, and some had left the ranks in their belief that the U.S. Government would never permit them to try to win back freedom for their own country.

Here in the United States there was great concern as to what determination should be made with respect to these Cuban invasion forces. This occurred prior to the beginning of the invasion. Should they be returned to the United States and dispersed, or should they be permitted to make the effort to free their own homeland?

While I was not consulted officially about this matter, my opinion was asked for by some people in lower echelons of the Government, and it was my judgment that the men should be permitted to make the effort to free their country, for they would never be happy until they had made this noble effort; but, of course, it should be made only after sound military judgment had been obtained that the endeavor had some chance of success.

Everyone now knows of the enormous miscalculations and mistakes that were made.

I think the President, whose final decision it was, did the right thing when he assumed the full responsibility for the fiasco. This was the manful and courageous thing to do. But the fact remains that there was considerable misjudgment on the part of many agencies and persons who had a part in the decision. No one man—be he even the President of the United States—can make correct judgments when he is proceeding from inadequate information.

The Bay of Pigs is now sad history. Had it succeeded, Cuba would have been free and our problems would have been lessened to a great extent, although, of course, not totally eliminated.

Some, it is now revealed, counseled against the invasion before it occurred. I thought, and still think, the "Go" signal was the correct one, based on the facts then available.

I never did subscribe to, nor do I now, the theory that the Latins would be appalled by our impetuosity or by our show of strength. Latins like leadership and strength; they always have, and they always will.

They have a history of 400 years of respecting, admiring, and looking up to strong leadership. That is why they still continue to admire strong leadership.

Everyone has 20-20 rear vision.

That judgment on the Bay of Pigs can be debated a long time. But surely the man who gave the word "Go; rescue your homeland; defeat and overthrow the Communists" cannot now in fairness have it even suggested that he is timorous or afraid of action. Couple this with the acts of October 1962, his quarantine, his confrontation with Khrushchev, and no man can fairly say that this President is not always prepared to act.

But to continue with the chronology, before discussing broader concepts, on June 21, 1961, shortly after Castro's May 1 declaration of Cuba as a Socialist, or Communist state, and some 2 months after the catastrophe at the Bay of Pigs, I again warned that "to hope Castro communism will wither away and die on the vine is both woolheaded and dangerous. Western Hemisphere nations must act now to expel Castro before he wins his race with time."

On July 20, 1961, in a speech on the Senate floor I urged U.S. recognition of the Cuban Government-in-exile and the creation of an Inter-American Military Force again.

I continued to urge on this administration the placing of an import embargo on trade with Castro, and I was highly gratified when on February 3, 1962, this administration took such action. Thereafter, the many millions of dollars which they had been receiving in trade were denied to them, and conditions were obviously made worse for Fidel Castro.

In a Florida speech on May 3, 1962, I stated that "Castro continued to work full throttle against the hemisphere's free nations," pointing out that Cuba has set up subversive schools, indoctrination centers, and propaganda classrooms to instruct teachers, students, intellectuals, political leaders, and revolutionaries from all over Latin America. I said:

The plan is to send these Communist-indoctrinated people back to their homelands and set them to work subverting their countries with the hoped-for Communist takeovers scheduled 1, 5 or even 10 years from now.

On June 18, 1962, I called for the establishment of a four-point program designed to make the policy of the United States toward Latin America, as I said, "one of realism and not romanticism."

I recommended the welding of our economic program in Latin America with our political goals; the establishment of an Under Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs reporting directly to the President; and again called for rec-

ognition of a Cuban Government-in-exile, stating, "We are going to have to meet this Red challenge with determination, and I am confident we will do so."

On September 5, 1962, I made this statement:

The presence in Cuba of 5,000 so-called technicians from the Soviet bloc makes even more compelling the need for an inter-American Police force to back up inter-hemispheric treaties based on the Monroe Doctrine which pledges to keep communism out of this hemisphere.

In addition, I urged, as I have time and again in the past, that the United States recognize and support a democratic Cuban Government-in-exile, whose first purpose is the liberation of the Cuban people from Communist tyranny. I said:

Such a free Cuban regime could openly receive support from the United States towards the accomplishment of this goal and the eventual restoration of their liberties to oppressed Cuban citizens.

On September 18, 1962, I introduced in the Senate two resolutions. One called for recognition of the Cuban Government-in-exile and the other supporting establishment of an inter-American military alliance.

Mr. President, some people may wonder why I have gone to such lengths to recite the record in such detail.

My answer is that I am trying to point out, among other things, why this problem of Cuba is not now and never has been the problem of a single political party, but instead, is the problem of both parties and all Americans. It is the problem of the Nation as a whole.

It goes without saying that so far as removing Castro and the Communists from Cuba is concerned, it would have been considerably easier to have done it in 1959 or 1960 than it would have been in 1961 or 1962, or than it will be in 1963 or 1964.

For the Island has been continuously fortified and militarized, and more and more modern and sophisticated weapons have been emplaced.

But no programs were developed in 1959 or 1960; and in January 1961, at the change of administrations, the outgoing one merely passed along the growing problem of Cuba to the incoming Administration, as one passes a very hot potato from his own hand to that of his unsuspecting dinner partner.

I have recited some—and only some—of the instances when I spoke in the Senate and elsewhere in 1961 and 1962, calling the attention of this administration to the need for developing a program having for its ultimate goal the freedom of Cuba. While I have yet to learn of a long-range program, this administration did put into effect, in 1961, the economic embargo which had as its result the denial to Castro of the use of many millions of dollars which he had previously realized each year from trade with this country.

The administration also diligently exercised pressure in an effort to get other allies to stop trading with Castro's Cuba. In this endeavor, the administration was moderately successful.

The administration did, in 1961, initiate a meeting of all the members of

the Organization of American States at Punta del Este, in Chile, and did succeed in getting three-fourths of the nations of the hemisphere—for the first time—to strongly condemn Fidel Castro and his brand of communism in Cuba.

That was the first time that such a specific resolution had ever been gotten from the Organization of American States. Since that time, several other minor measures have been adopted, looking toward making life more difficult for the Communists in Cuba; but the problem of communism in Cuba remains and constantly grows.

Mr. President, Cuba is a serious problem equaling in importance, in my judgment, any that we have in Europe or in southeast Asia or anywhere else in the world. It cannot be swept under the rug, ignored, or minimized; and I do not believe that anyone, or any government, is today trying to do that, because all recognize now the total seriousness of the problem of Cuba.

It is a problem that, if not handled correctly, could quickly lead to nuclear war. It is a problem that may lead to the involvement of the United States and its allies in a bloody conventional war. It is fraught with peril of most every kind; and certainly, therefore, it should not be discussed or debated in partisan terms.

Our Nation's future and the future of the free world are too important to become topics of partisan discussion. At the same time, they are important enough to deserve and bear discussion by troubled and conscientious men and women who are sincerely seeking solutions.

The problem of Cuba, therefore, deserves the best nonpartisan attention of all of our minds in the best and highest tradition of Americans who are earnestly concerned about the future of our country.

RUSSIAN TROOP BUILDUP

Mr. President, in September 1962, while many of us were campaigning, we began to see in the press and to hear over the radio reports about the now-famed buildup of Russian offensive missiles and bombers.

I must say that prior to that time, on many visits in and out of Miami, where the refugee colony makes its headquarters, I had been advised by Cuban refugee friends that they thought missiles were being erected in Cuba. Some gave me handmade maps depicting the location of the alleged missiles; others wrote letters describing them; others merely poured into my ears their suspicions and fears.

I turned over every scrap of this information to the Central Intelligence Agency, where I thought it should go for proper examination and evaluation.

However, Mr. President, it is eminently clear that prior to October 14, the day when the "picture" was finally obtained of missiles actually on site, there was really no hard, provable evidence on hand, not the kind of certain and demonstrable evidence on which a great and responsible nation could act.

There were circumstances and there was considerable talk on the part of ref-

ugees regarding a missile buildup; and to me it was apparent that this word was getting to the CIA and to our intelligence outfits for the U-2 flights, which all through the summer had been occurring on a basis of two every month, and which were stepped up to four a month in September.

In September, there were flights on September 5, 17, 26, and 29; in October there were flights on the 5th and the 7th, and, of course, on the 14th. None produced any evidence of the missiles, although the reports continued to come in, and many people began to believe the missiles were there, even though no photograph had shown them. Then, I think, some adjustments began to be made even prior to October 14, although I have no exact knowledge of this. In any event, the overflight of October 14 showed the missiles.

Thereafter, the President of the United States called off his speaking trip, returned to Washington, met with the heads of the CIA, the Defense and the State Departments, and others, and, after great soul searching, evolved a program as to what would be done.

All of us know now that the congressional leadership on both sides was called back to Washington, prior to the President's speech on October 22.

The President announced to those of us gathered at the White House what had developed in Cuba; and, after discussion, he stated what he intended to do. There was comment with respect to additional steps which some of those present thought should be taken. However, the President fully and satisfactorily explained why he felt it was more correct to pursue the course upon which he had determined.

Everyone there, publicly or privately, I am sure, pledged his support to the President and the course of action which the President outlined for the Nation to follow.

I am sure that everyone of us was greatly moved and deeply concerned as the President delivered his magnificent message, in which he clearly pointed out that there would be no toleration of Communist offensive missiles or bombers in Cuba; that the offensive missiles had to be removed; that if any of them was launched at the United States or at our neighbors, the United States would fire back—not at Cuba, but at the source of the problem, the Soviet Union.

I am sure that all of us recall vividly with what great apprehension and concern we lived in the next few hours and the next few days. And as the build-up of our manpower and might in south Florida and the Caribbean speeded up, I am sure we all recall with what final consummate relief we heard the announcement that Mr. Khrushchev had, in effect, backed down; that he had agreed to the withdrawal of the offensive weapons.

We truly, as the Bible says, "walked through the valley of the shadow" and emerged unscathed.

Mr. Khrushchev did not wish, at this time at least, to start a war over Cuba, for he agreed to back his missiles and bombers out of Cuba, which must have been humiliating and awkward for him.

While we did not get the on-site inspection asked for, because of Castro's intransigence, nevertheless the Communists permitted our planes to fly at low altitudes over the missile sites, without gunfire being directed at them, and permitted inspection by our airplanes and our surface ships of the missiles and bombers being returned to the Soviet Union.

It is also worthy of note that today our planes are daily flying low and high over Cuba, for inspection purposes; and none of the very effective anti-aircraft weapons—the SAM, the SA-2, and others which have great efficiency—have been fired at our planes. Mr. Khrushchev realized that the President was and is ready to go to any extremity to get those offensive weapons—a threat to U.S. security—removed from Cuba, and, furthermore, that he had to be satisfied that they were removed. That is why the Communists have permitted the flights every day over Cuba, to observe what is happening with respect to missiles, troop concentrations, and removals. No shot has been fired at our photographic planes, and none will be fired, because the President has made it crystal clear he will not permit it without instant retaliation.

Mr. Khrushchev, having also agreed to withdraw some of the 17,000 troops remaining in Cuba after the missiles and bombers left, is now in process of doing that. How many have left, I do not know. But State Department sources indicate that some 2,500 have left, and also even some of the units of the four armored groups that were there.

I was pleased to note in the March 9 issue of the Washington Star, however, that Mr. Antoly Dobrynin, Soviet Foreign Minister, stated that a substantial pullout would be completed by mid-March, as Mr. Khrushchev had promised. I am certain that President Kennedy is exerting all the influence he can to see to it that all the Russian forces are withdrawn from the island.

It is interesting to see what some people—now that the critical danger has receded—have chosen to criticize. When the President, in late October, held our national and individual destinies in his hands, few voices were heard; almost everyone was breathless while the President spoke clearly and firmly. I, for one, did not have much to say, and I do not recall that anyone did.

Now, however, there are loud cries and criticisms of an intelligence gap between September and October, of inter-agency confusion, over concessions made or imagined, and so forth. But the important thing to remember is that the President when confronted with the actual direct threat to the security of the United States acted with consummate courage and skill to protect our national interest. He acted in accord with the highest traditions of American statesmanship and successfully eliminated a threat of monstrous proportions to our national existence.

Because the Constitution of the United States puts into the hands of the executive branch of the Government—or the President of the United States—the final

authority and responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, I think he should be permitted without personal harassment or political attack to proceed along this logical line of getting Soviet troops removed from Cuba, for I would challenge anyone to suggest that there is a more useful course of action looking toward the total solution of the problem of Cuba than that of removing the troops and technicians of the Soviet Union from Cuba.

But, Mr. President, what of the future? What are our long-range goals?

Certainly, they are to see Cuba freed. But do we have a program or a plan of action? If the President has, of course he does not have to tell it to anyone. I have not heard of any plan, and I think if we are to free Cuba and keep the respect of our Latin neighbors we have to have a plan or a program which we can logically follow to a final and happy solution of a free Cuba.

Now I would like to offer a program, or plan of action, but before doing so I want to make it clear I speak only for myself. I speak only for the junior Senator from Florida. I have not cleared this speech with anyone. This voice is speaking only for me.

In the past I have recommended all sorts of programs of action. I have talked about a combination of measures, embargoes, quarantines, economic measures, political measures, propaganda measures, diplomatic measures, and others. But at no time have I recommended that the United States declare war on Cuba or act unilaterally with our own military force.

Since the buildup of weapons and men in Cuba last fall by the Soviets, the situation has changed. We now have a new dimension to consider, the possibility of direct confrontation of Soviet troops and United States troops.

Furthermore, in the light of the enormous amount of military equipment put into Cuba, we have a much more difficult situation to deal with than we did in 1960 or 1961.

When we talk about strong measures today, particularly when we imply force even though we may not say it, we are in reality talking about a direct confrontation of the military forces of the United States with the military forces of the Soviet Union, unless we first are successful in getting these forces out of Cuba. Such a confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States forces we have not had thus far in our history.

During the Korean war, while we fought the Red Chinese and undoubtedly many Soviets, nevertheless they operated clandestinely under color of the North Koreans and/or Red Chinese. However, so long as the Soviet military troops remain in Cuba, the prospects of escalating action in Cuba into total war are infinitely greater because any unilateral action against Cuba, or even action led by U.S. forces puts, for the first time, U.S. military forces in direct confrontation with those of the Soviet Union.

As stated, I think this adds a new dimension of danger to our already difficult problem.

I do not go so far as to say that we should never act, or that we should not proceed, even if some of the military of the Soviet Union stay there. I would emphasize, however, that the solution to the problem of Cuba, which means the elimination of communism from Cuba, is infinitely easier without the Soviet forces there. I say that their removal will diminish greatly the prospects of whatever action is finally taken in Cuba escalating into a total world and nuclear war. It has been the consideration of this problem, the gravity of it, the enormity of it, the complexity of it, which has made me feel that the President is on the right track in first getting removed from Cuba the offensive missiles and bombers and, thereafter, insisting upon the removal of the Soviet personnel.

Furthermore, we must keep in mind that today, when we suggest further action, either in the form of a blockade or a raid, this involves the use of force. And force, of course, means war. It might be limited and small—or it might be unlimited and staggering in its consequences. When we embark on a blockade of an island like Cuba, for it to be effective the blockader must make up his mind he may have to go to the length of shooting and sinking a surface ship as one starts into Cuba with supplies and personnel, or of shooting down an aircraft which is loaded with supplies and personnel.

In any event, the act of shooting a plane or a ship is an act of war and, as the President said in his last news conference, any such action on our part will probably call up an immediate response.

Furthermore, let us be sure when we talk of force and war we know what we are talking about. This use of force, this war we are talking about, is not a cold war waged in the daily press and over the conference tables. It is not a war of words in which our Secretary of Defense corrects the blusterings of the Soviet Defense Minister on the number of operative U.S. missiles or the size of our thermonuclear bombs. Not even a guerrilla war in which railroad bridges are destroyed and crops burned or sugar mills sabotaged.

We are talking about a war in which troops storm a beachhead, where platoons are sent to knock out a bunker, a war in which villages are destroyed by artillery fire, a war in which lives would be lost and men maimed and crippled for life, a war which could well leave fatherless thousands of children.

There may be some who think that now is the time for war. Some who advocate, rather glibly, that American forces turn quickly on Castro's Cuba—and get the job over with. It may come to that, but everyone should know exactly what they are talking about. I hope they have given thought to not just the phrases but the consequences as well.

How many American troops, for example, would be required to die in order to land a large effective fighting force on an island which has 150 coastal defense missiles and operational sites for most of them? These missiles can reach

troop ships 40 miles out. How many troops, landing craft, and even transports could be sent to the bottom of the Caribbean by a dozen operative missile launching torpedo boats, whose launch range is 15 miles, which the Cubans now have?

How many aircraft would be lost in attaining air superiority over a small island with 500 surface to antiaircraft missiles and defended by 100 Migs, over 40 of them capable of matching our F-104 Starfighter in performance and all piloted, we must presume, by skilled aviators and directed by 200 modern radars?

How many soldiers would be lost in subduing a force of some 75,000 regular and, we must presume, fanatically indoctrinated troops, fighting on their home ground, and backed by at least 100,000 militiamen and 100,000 home guard troops?

They are fully equipped with tanks, field artillery pieces, antitank guns and other modern weapons. They are a formidable force and would be operating defensively, taking a tremendous toll of any liberating force.

Once a beachhead for the liberating force was established how long would the battle for the island take?

How many casualties, American casualties, would it cost to subdue Cuba?

I have no access to contingency plans but we hear figures such as a month and 100,000 casualties. I gather that our military planners see no quick, glorious charge up San Juan Hill now. Rather they envision a long, grueling, and bloody war waged in the most exhausting and savage tradition of the 20th century world wars.

And would the war for the liberation of Cuba remain limited?

I challenge anyone to say he knows. We can carry on some logical speculation. It might be a war confined to the island of Cuba and the waters surrounding it.

Or it might be a war which precipitates a Soviet move into Berlin with all that implies. Or action in Cuba might precipitate full-scale conflict in southeast Asia, particularly South Vietnam or Laos.

Or how do we know that the war to liberate Cuba will not really touch off the total thermonuclear conflict which each of us prays daily will not occur. Soviet Defense Minister Malinovsky says it will. Can we assume he does not mean it?

Our Defense Secretary has said we will defend Berlin—with nuclear bombs if necessary—and I am sure every man in this Chamber approves this stand and knows that Mr. McNamara spoke for the President when he said it. We know the United States means it, that we will defend West Berlin and if necessary with nuclear weapons.

Malinovsky has said essentially the same thing about Cuba. Can we be certain he does not mean what he said?

Can we be as certain that he does not mean it as we are certain that Secretary McNamara does?

I do not know. To take action which could imperil the national existence on

the basis of a pleasant and encouraging assumption would be one of the greatest gambles in history. I believe that it is within the context of real and violent warfare that the calls for a blockade or an all-out assault on Cuba must be evaluated. Well, if war is the final answer, if any Member of this Chamber feels it is worth it at this point in order to clear Russian troops from Cuba, he is in the right place to call for it.

As we all know, Congress has the right to declare war on Russia, on Cuba, and the first step is for one of the Members of the body to submit a resolution declaring the existence of a state of war. This has not yet been done, and I do not think it will be done any time soon.

However, while the consequences of any meaningful action are extremely grave, we must nevertheless not be frightened out of doing our duty or living up to our traditions of fighting for freedom.

As we look at the present situation and talk about it with some appreciation of what we are talking about, let us not fail to offer solutions, if we think we have them, but let us make whatever suggestions we have in the realization that the problem is a bipartisan matter and that if we become totally involved, bullets do not merely pick out Democrats or Republicans. Neither red-blooded Americans nor bullets know partisanship.

In this context of understanding, without political motivations and only in an effort to be helpful to the President of the United States, who, of course, has to make the final decision for all in this Nation on matters of this character, I would like for the next few minutes to discuss the situation as it exists today, and what I think we may have to do in the future, and why.

I think we must first settle in our minds whether or not this Nation can long abide Fidel Castro and communism in Cuba.

I know that there is a small body of opinion that would say because Cuba is now too dangerous for us to fool with, therefore, we should do nothing about it except ignore it and hope it goes away.

I am not one of those who subscribe to that theory of hoping it will go away. For hope has yet to remove a Communist dictatorship anywhere in the world.

Tightly controlled police states do not wither on the vine. I do not believe the Communists will surrender merely because we hope they will.

There are others who subscribe to the containment theory as the policy to follow under present circumstances—the easiest policy to follow. Containment is the recognition of the status quo within a country, while at the same time restricting its overt actions outside its borders. However, the danger from Cuba today does not lie solely in the fact that it may attack over the border a neighbor country. We are pledged to and we can easily stop that.

The danger in a continuing Communist government in Cuba, even though contained within Cuba's physical boundaries, lies in that Cuba will continue as it is now, the fountainhead of subversion, propaganda, and training. We can stop the exportation of its troops to oth-

er lands, but we cannot stop the exportation of its ideas, its propaganda, its training of subversives.

Millions of tons of literature depart Cuba for other Central and South American countries every month. Propaganda broadcasts to Central and South America have been increased in the last 18 months from 80 hours a week to over 150 hours.

John McCone, Director of the CIA, admitted recently, and it was made public, that some 1,500 revolutionaries from other Central and South American countries trained in Cuba last year. This type of activity is almost impossible to stop, short of extirpating the Communist government itself.

However, the greatest danger of a "contained" but "continuing" Cuba under communism is that it negates and renders ineffective our long-range program of helping our Latin American neighbors through the Alliance for Progress.

As we all know, Alianza Para el Progreso is a program calculated to build up the economy, the standards of living, and the literacy of the people, through economic and technical aid from the United States, while simultaneously effecting tax, land and social reform from within.

It envisions the expenditure of U.S. funds in the neighborhood of close to \$1 billion each year for 10 years. For this noble purpose, however, Mr. President, Latin America needs 90 percent more funds than this. It was reasoned that these additional large sums would be supplied from two sources: First, the country itself; and second, private capital. However, neither of these two sources is available if communism remains in Cuba.

As the Alliance was planned, 80 percent of the contribution was to be made by the Latins themselves, both through their governments and through private investment. However, with local governments, such as Venezuela, expending their time and energies in building up their armed forces, staying busy putting down Cuban instigated riots, spending their money and energies on day-to-day existence, the deep economic and social problems will never get either the attention or the money which their solution require.

And private investment, either of Latin American or United States origin, is obviously going to look for more stable and secure markets, even if the interest rate is not as high as it currently is in Latin America. A corporate executive is not going to put his stockholders' money into an area where it might be confiscated without any reimbursement, as was done in Cuba, nor is a private individual going to invest his savings in a land which may fall under a Communist influence at any given moment.

As an example, the flow of new U.S. private investment in South America has plummeted in recent years. In 1957 U.S. citizens and businesses put \$1,164 million in direct investment into the area. By 1961 direct new investment had dropped to only \$141 million, a drop of more than 70 percent. This figure comes from the Bureau of International Commerce of the Department of Commerce.

Government sources estimate that when the 1962 totals are finally calculated they will show a flow back to the United States of more than \$10 million. In other words, more U.S. private capital was pulled out than was put into Latin America in 1962.

In the case of needed private investment from Latin sources themselves, the situation appears equally critical.

Because of the threat of a Communist-type dictatorship in most every country of South America, local capital is fleeing in enormous amounts out of Latin America into banks and investment in Switzerland, Great Britain, the United States, and even Hong Kong.

The Alliance for Progress is the most realistic, long-term attempt we have ever made to help the Latin American nations out of the cycle of poverty, ignorance, and illness, in which for centuries they have been caught. It must not fail if we are to keep the countries to the south of us in the column of the free world. Yet there can be no doubt that the continued existence of Castro's Cuba insures its eventual failure. Because the Alliance, operating by itself does not have the money to do the job, because the U.S. Treasury cannot fill the vacuum caused by the fear of investment on the part of outside private capital and the flight of local capital.

This means, Mr. President, that Fidel Castro and communism must go before we can get moving on the big job of realizing the aims and ambitions of the Alliance for Progress.

How then can we get Castro and communism out of Cuba? I see only two alternatives.

First, we can, through various sources, attempt to foster an internal defection and uprising against Castro—in effect, turn Castro's own weapons back on him. This has some appeal primarily because it looks easy, but the lessons learned from East Germany and Hungary cause some pessimism. A rebellion against a tightly controlled police state is not likely to succeed.

No doubt there are in Cuba huge numbers of people among the military, the campesinos, the laborers, and, in fact, among all groups and classes, who are praying for the demise of Castro and the Communists. But in a land under communism, overridden with informers, and disciplined by brutal secret police, the organization and execution of a revolt or mass defection is an infinitely difficult thing. Perhaps it could be successful in Cuba, but being realistic rather than romantic, we should not count on it.

It seems to me in searching for a plan of attack, we must face up to the fact that there is no easy or inexpensive short-run solution to the problem of Castro and communism. There was in 1959. It might have still been easy in 1960, but no longer.

Realizing the problem of Castro and communism will not be solved overnight, I suggest putting into action a long-range plan which envisions only ultimately, and, in the final analysis, if need be, the use of force in order to get rid of Fidel Castro.

However, if it comes to force, the program envisions Latins and Cubans, who believe in freedom, leading that force against the Latin Communists of Fidel Castro. In other words, the program envisions Latins-for-freedom versus Latins-for-dictatorship.

After all, the problems posed by Castro are greatest with respect to the Latin American nations, and as such it is the Latin nations which should begin to bear an increasing responsibility for bringing about a solution.

More specifically, communism has established its hemispheric fortress in Cuba and, in the final analysis, it should be, and can be the Cubans who assume the leadership in what will have to be of necessity a joint undertaking.

The value of turning to the Latins to provide the leadership and most of the manpower required to do the job, returns the problem to its proper place as a Western Hemisphere problem, to be handled within the framework of already existing treaties and agreements entered into by all the Western Hemisphere countries.

Furthermore, there is no sense in purposely bringing about a situation in which Mr. Khrushchev, already ignominiously removing his missiles from Cuba, is required once again to either back down or fight, because of direct confrontation with our troops, or a specific challenge from us.

I do not know, and I do not believe anyone does, just how far Mr. Khrushchev believes he can back up before he destroys his own position, with his ally the belligerent Chinese Reds, or with his own military leaders within the Soviet Union.

I see no point in plotting a course at this time that does not afford Mr. Khrushchev a door through which he can move to avoid confrontation with us, if he wants to. This program which I shall suggest, in which the action taken is called for and lead by Cubans and Latins, in some measure avoids the confrontation and thereby lessens the possibility that, if and when force comes into use, the encounter will escalate into total war or nuclear war.

If the Cubans and other freedom-loving Latins are to take charge of the Castro problem, there must be a rallying point for them, a central body which can focus and direct their efforts. I see no group which can do this, which can speak in the name of all the Cuban people, except a fully constituted Government-in-exile which is recognized by us and other hemispheric nations. We should acknowledge its power to make treaties, conduct foreign relations, borrow money, establish armed forces, and enter into all activities of a regularly constituted government. As I understand it, from international lawyers dealing regularly with such matters, our recognition of an exile government would be preceded by withdrawal of recognition of the present regime.

The only argument I have heard against such a government-in-exile is, How will it be formed when all the exiles are divided as to who or what group will lead it?

First, I am certain that any government selected by the Government of the United States and announced as the exile Government of Cuba will, in fact, be the Government-in-exile. However, there is a more democratic method of procedure if our officials want to follow it.

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and Refugee Committee have the names and addresses of every refugee in the United States and Puerto Rico. Why not send each one a ballot, asking him or her to write their first, second, or third choices down—sort of like an absentee ballot here in all our States of the United States.

It would be relatively simple to carry out a poll by mail and under the supervision of a group of prominent exiled Cuban jurists, in which each exiled Cuban adult is asked for a free expression of who should head an exile Government. No doubt, there would be some errors and duplication—this is inevitable—but it would provide a consensus and would give support to the man or men who finally act as the Government-in-exile.

Once it was established who the Cuban people had selected to lead the fight to free their homeland, U.S. recognition should be immediate.

This would emphasize to the other hemispheric nations that the efforts of free Cubans to expunge communism from Cuba have our full support and lead to recognition of the exile Government by other hemispheric nations.

Moreover, there are nations in Latin America which would act as host to the Government-in-exile. I will not bring about their subjection to pressure and harassment by mentioning their names here. But they have made it clear that they would allow a Cuban Government-in-exile to operate from their soil.

I am not suggesting that the Government-in-exile be the government which takes over the power of Cuba once the freedom of the Cuban homeland has been regained. On the contrary, it should be understood that the Cuban Government in exile maintains our recognition only so long as it takes to free Cuba and, thereafter, hold a democratic election on Cuban soil with all the people of Cuba participating.

Once formed and established, the Cuban Government, under the Rio Treaty of 1947, the Caracas Agreement of 1954, the Punte del Este agreements of 1961, and, in fact, the basic provisions of the Organization of American States, could call upon all the nations of the Western Hemisphere for military and financial assistance. And under those provisions we and the other nations are legally and/or normally obliged to help. With this military equipment, they could begin to tighten the noose on Fidel Castro.

The Cuban Government-in-exile would itself be able to, with the use of PT boats and other craft acquired from throughout the hemisphere, place a selective type blockade on the Island of Cuba, cutting off the supply of oil and other essential supplies needed for Castro's armed forces.

Simultaneously, it could foster defection within Cuba by providing arms and munitions to those who would turn against Castro. This, I submit, is the only realistic course to follow for those who rely on the defection from within alternative. Help from outside Cuba is needed, and Cubans could supply it all.

Propaganda barrages could be established with Cubans talking to Cubans. The Government-in-exile could ask and insist, under the treaties, that all Latin American nations which had not already done so, close their shores to Castro's embassies. This would stop most of the subversive propaganda now flowing out of Cuba. The Cuban Government, acting in the name of freedom, could ask that all trade with Castro be stopped. They can ask this cooperation from all members of the OAS, whereas the United States which is, technically, not directly involved, could not.

Cubans could easily smuggle goods to the underground in Cuba without having to run the gauntlet of the U.S. Immigration and Border Patrol officials, who now stop them and defeat their major efforts.

There is a good chance that such an exile Government, supported and supplied by all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, could nourish sufficient defection within Cuba to topple Castro, and, of course, that is to be desired.

But, if in the final analysis it were needed, that exile Government could undertake the liberation of its home by the force of arms. As a member of the OAS, and under the provision of the treaties of Rio and Caracas this Government could call on other member nations for whatever assistance would be required—including arms—to bring about a successful conclusion to their efforts. Under the commitments imposed on the United States and the other hemispheric nations by longstanding treaties, we would be legally bound and acting within the dictates of our international obligations in answering the Cuban exile Government's request for help.

Surely, we and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere would respond, just as we responded to the call of the English and French in World Wars I and II. We would respond because we believe in freedom and the right of self-determination, and it is just as precious and dead in this hemisphere as in the Continent of Europe or the far away reaches of southeast Asia.

The proposal is not a roadmap to utopia. Liberation of Cuba by forces directed by a government-in-exile is a long-range prospect. There would have to be a time-consuming buildup of governmental organizations, operating funds, and troops. The problems would be large.

But similar problems have been faced before and overcome. There is more to bind together the various groups of Cuban exiles than there is to divide them. And the promise of realistic help in returning to a free homeland would be a powerful lever in bringing about pressure in the direction of unity.

Properly organized and motivated, I feel that it could take effective action. I believe that people by the hundreds of

thousands on the Latin American continent—from the humblest campesinos to chiefs of state would realize that this Government was acting for all of them and would make common cause with it. Tens of thousands of young men from all over the continent would, I believe, join the ranks of its fighting forces. This exile-Government could provide a living illustration that the battle cry of freedom still rings clearest in the human heart.

A Cuba Government-in-exile is the force which, acting on behalf of and in the name of the Cuban people, can bring about the liberation of their island. This is the group which can properly take any and all action necessary to successfully wage a war of liberation.

Once communism and Castroism are eliminated in Cuba the United States must continue its interest in Latin America. We must continue our program of long-range assistance to enable the Latin governments to bring about a better life for their people. We must reform our thinking and remember that we exist side by side, interdependent, whether communism threatens or not.

Mr. President, I said early in my remarks that I believe one day Cubans will again enjoy the blessings of liberty, freedom, and self-government. No member of this body wants more than I to see that day come and to hasten its approach.

I have today presented a plan which I think can free Cuba. I feel it is a sensible and logical course of action and commend it to those who are searching for ways to free Cuba and drive communism from the hemisphere. In the final analysis the President of the United States makes the final judgment—the ultimate decision, as to what will be this Nation's course of operation. I am sure he is prayerfully considering all proposals suggested as to what course to follow. Whatever his decision I intend to support the President in whatever action he takes. I know that all citizens and patriots will do likewise.

SENATE SHOULD INVESTIGATE THREATENED CHANGES IN IRS FIELD STRUCTURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, since the Secretary of the Treasury announced the proposed changes in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service on March 5, a number of Senators have voiced deep concern. Let me say that I fully share this concern. The cogent reasons supporting such protests merit the careful attention of those responsible in the administration for the proposals.

Apart from the political implications involved in the proposed changes, they would have a drastic effect on a substantial number of Nebraskans, most of whom have served the Internal Revenue Service faithfully for many years. Certainly the same would be true in the other affected areas.

In order to give Commissioner Caplin an opportunity to justify his proposals, I requested specific information about the claimed savings.

I had thought that my letter did not impose unusual demands on the Commissioner, because the high level ad hoc Committee on Resources Utilization which he appointed early in 1962 to study revisions was to have its recommendations available by December 1962. However, apparently I raised some questions that this "high level" committee had not considered because, as of this time, the Commissioner has not replied.

Thus, I think it is appropriate to discuss the matter here.

The Commissioner's claim that he can accomplish a \$5 million annual savings without reducing the service to the taxpayer is attractive. However, there is serious doubt that it can be accomplished.

Further doubt has been cast on the proposals by the Secretary of the Treasury who, upon encountering opposition, announced to the press that action would be deferred until he has had more time to review the plans.

However welcome this decision is, it will not settle the question. The time for review has passed.

According to a letter sent to all Internal Revenue Service employees, the recommendations of the Committee on Resources Utilization were in the hands of the Treasury Department officials prior to February 7 of this year. Hence, the Secretary has had a whole month to review the program.

If a further review is to occur, I strongly recommend that the Secretary get together with his Commissioner, because the Commissioner continues to act as if he does not intend to change his plans.

It is important that there be a complete investigation of the proposals by the Senate Finance Committee. Otherwise, the plan may be fully implemented while we are still awaiting a report from the Secretary. Such an investigation would, among other things, scrutinize the inconsistencies that manifest themselves in the Commissioner's proposals.

Consider first the case of Omaha, with which I am most familiar. By January 1, 1964, the Commissioner intends to reduce the present Omaha staff of 297 to 83. He has indicated that he will try to reduce the adverse impact on these people as much as possible. He has reaffirmed this position in a recent statement to the press, and a member of his staff advised my office that those who wished to remain in the Service will be retained for at least 2 years at the same GS rating whether their position is downgraded or not.

Mr. President, I do not know how the Department can incur the expense of moving employees and their families, maintain them at the same salary until after the 1964 presidential election, and still accomplish a net savings.

Furthermore, the Commissioner indicated that most of the officials and employees whose positions will be eliminated have risen to their present positions by doing their work well and have experience and skill that the Internal Revenue Service does not want to lose. Nevertheless, he indicated that he expects to lose some of their positions.

While Commissioner Caplin is in the process of eliminating skillful and experienced personnel the President is proposing to increase the number of Internal Revenue Service employees from an estimated 60,300 in fiscal year 1963 to 64,086 by the end of fiscal 1964. Obviously, if the President sees a need for increasing the present personnel level in the Internal Revenue Service by approximately 3,700, then certainly he must also feel the need to replace the employees that will be lost through the proposed changes. The replacement of long time skillful and experienced personnel with new and inexperienced personnel does not seem to me to be consistent with the President's goal of obtaining a lean, fit, and efficient establishment.

When the Internal Revenue Service was reorganized in 1952, two primary objectives were to decentralize service to taxpayers and restore integrity and public confidence where it was lacking.

The proposed plan is hardly consistent with the sound objective of decentralizing service to the taxpayers. On the contrary, Omaha, which is the most nearly central location that could be obtained for all the various States in the present region, is being eliminated in favor of Chicago. Chicago, on the other hand, is at the extreme eastern edge of the proposed region. It is difficult to visualize how the Commissioner expects to accomplish a savings by this move when he is obviously increasing the cost of employee travel within the region?

Furthermore, in an attempt to justify the move from New York to Boston, the argument has been advanced that it will place the regional office closer to the Automatic Data Processing Center at Lawrence, Mass. If this is the reason for the New York move, then how can the Omaha move be justified? Under the present regional structure, the ADP service center is scheduled for Kansas City, Mo., just 175 miles from Omaha. If the regional office is moved to Chicago, the ADP center will be 500 miles away.

In his fiscal 1962 report, Commissioner Caplin referred to the "blue ribbon" program which was launched by the Service in 1956 for the purpose of increasing the caliber and productivity of its work force. The Commissioner noted that—

Since that time the Service has been conducting vigorous college recruitment campaigns to attract top-quality applicants to enter revenue employment, and, at the same time, has provided training to enhance employees' ability to perform at the full-working level.

According to the report—

These recruitments and training programs have been geared into well-developed career programs designed to encourage top-caliber people to stay in the Service and assure their orderly progression to more responsible positions. Through its "blue ribbon" program, the Service has been advanced to the forefront as one of the most progressive agencies in the Federal service.

Commissioner Caplin notes in his yearend report that he has followed the "blue ribbon" recruitment program. Nevertheless, he now proposes changes which will undermine his program for

recruiting top-caliber people. The insecurity of working for a service which eliminates top-caliber personnel after many years of service could hardly be encouraging to young college recruits.

The obvious political implications involved in transferring the New York regional office to Boston have been adequately discussed by my colleagues in this Chamber. At first it appeared that the elimination of the Omaha office in favor of the Chicago office was done so that the proponents of the changes could answer their critics by referring to the elimination of not one, but two, regional offices. However, one could wonder whether the favor granted to Chicago is not as politically bold as the favor granted to Boston. These moves are hardly designed to restore public confidence in the service, one of the prime objectives of the 1952 reorganization.

Mr. President, since the changes were announced, I have received many letters protesting the changes and calling for congressional investigation and further study. Unless there is a clear statement from either the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that implementation of these plans is suspended, it is my hope, Mr. President, that the Senate Finance Committee will call for an accounting of these disturbing and unfortunate proposals at the earliest possible time.

SALUTE TO "CAP" SANDERS AND THE NEBRASKA STATE SAFETY PATROL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the mobility of Americans is one of the phenomena of our times. Faster than we can build superhighways up and down and across our States, cars and trucks fill the lanes from shoulder to median strip. This striking similarity to a river at floodtide once prompted a friend of mine to describe Highway 30 as "running bankfull."

Unnerving as this situation may be to the ordinary traveler, it would be completely unmanageable except for a largely unappreciated group of young men whose job it is to protect life and limb and property along the roadways, America's 50 State highway patrols.

I am reminded of the exceptional quality of their work by the recent announcement of the retirement of Col. C. J. "Cap" Sanders, one of the original members of the Nebraska Safety Patrol after over 25 years of service in that organization. He will leave his post on June 13 of this year, having reached mandatory retirement age.

Colonel Sanders was 1 of the 14 members of the original force of 44 men still in Nebraska's 25-year-old patrol. He is its third commander, a position he assumed in 1941.

It has been my pleasure to know and work with him throughout that period. He is one of the most dedicated and loyal public officials I have ever known. No department of Nebraska's State government can surpass the record of the patrol under his inspiring leadership. No agency is more respected by the public it serves.

Mr. President, as sentinels of law, order, and peace, our State patrolmen undergo hardships and often risk their lives to protect the lives and property of our citizens. Too frequently their activities are taken for granted and go largely unnoticed.

The fact that States have delegated local police powers to counties, cities, and townships has not impaired their authority to exercise their primary police responsibilities whenever situations have arisen which have demanded such action. In response to such a demand, the formation of State police forces began in the early 1800's, but not until the first half of this century did the movement spread to all the States.

The genesis of the present State police was in the Texas Rangers, recruited in 1835 as a border patrol. They were followed in 1865 by Massachusetts where a few State constables were appointed and were given police power to be exercised in the rural areas. Connecticut followed suit in 1903 with a small State police force patterned along the lines of the force in Massachusetts.

In 1905, with the organization of the Pennsylvania State Constabulary the first really authentic State police department came into existence, thus introducing a new idea in State police systems. Its purpose was to provide an executive arm for the State, to assist in handling disturbed conditions in the coal fields, and to provide protection in the rural areas that were without adequate law enforcement agencies. From the beginning the Pennsylvania State Constabulary operated as a uniformed and mounted force.

The rapid rise of rural crime and the universal use of the automobile, with its attendant problems of crime and traffic, led to the development of similar State police organizations within all the States during the first half of this century.

In Nebraska the State Safety Patrol was established in 1937. Its motto, "pro bono publico," "For the good of the public," has been and continues to be the basis for its every activity. During the 26 years of its operation, the force has grown from the original 44 patrolmen to 209. The highest standards of personnel selection and training have been maintained, which with the use of the latest technical equipment, have combined to provide the citizens of Nebraska with quick and efficient law enforcement. This is a commendable and admirable reflection on Colonel Sanders and his predecessors, R. F. Weller, and R. T. Schrien.

Because of the effective and high-quality work of the Nebraska State Safety Patrol, the traffic death rate has been kept well below the national average. In 1960, Nebraska's death rate per hundred million vehicle miles was 4.3, while the average rate in the United States was 5.3. This figure also represents a new low from the 12.8 death rate which prevailed in 1937 when the Nebraska State Safety Patrol came into being.

The activities of State patrolmen in Nebraska as well as in other States range from rescue work in the wake of violent

storms and floods, to the apprehension of dangerous criminals; from courteously helping a traveler change a tire, to directing, controlling, and patrolling traffic. The State police movement has built a fine tradition of courageous service and unselfish devotion to duty.

A patrolman's working conditions are far from the best. Owing to the large areas which must be protected, he is subject to the demands of his job day and night. In the face of difficult working conditions, he remains a symbol of courtesy and willing helpfulness.

For the past quarter of a century, the Nebraska Safety Patrol has been "Cap" Sanders' life. While there are many who will agree with the Hastings Tribune which observed editorially that his mandatory retirement at 60 is "a terrific waste of manpower," there are none who will not wish him Godspeed and congratulate him on a difficult job commendably done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD stories on Colonel Sanders' retirement, taken from the February 17 editions of the Lincoln Journal & Star and the Omaha World-Herald, together with an editorial from the February 25 edition of the Hastings Daily Tribune.

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

[From the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune, Feb. 25, 1963]

COLONEL SANDERS' MOTIVE IN ADDING 80 MEN TO THE NEBRASKA PATROL IS TO SAVE LIVES

"If the patrol is given a sufficient number of men, we'll put a terrific dent in the number of people killed last year," Col. C. J. Sanders, director of Nebraska's State Safety Patrol, told the members of the legislature's budget committee. Colonel Sanders asked the committee to approve an expenditure of \$2,250,000 a year for support of the patrol during the 1963-65 biennium which starts next July 1.

When Colonel Sanders, several months ago, proposed increasing the patrol by 80 as a means of reducing the State's traffic death toll there were many critics. Some of them contended that Colonel Sanders, like so many other directors of public agencies, was merely trying to add to his own prestige by having more patrolmen under his command.

That statement wasn't true then and it isn't true now. The patrol commander has just made public the knowledge that because of age he is being forced to retire from duty next June. This in itself is a terrific waste of manpower, because there are few men who have his experience in traffic enforcement work. He will be only 60 years of age. In a great majority of instances mandatory retirement age is 65.

Colonel Sanders made a strong case in behalf of his request for an increase in the number of patrolmen.

For example, he pointed out that although there are 209 patrolmen, 17 are involved in administrative work leaving 176 for patrolling highways. But these men can't work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The result is there are 63 men to cover the vast highway system of the State.

Is it any wonder that you can drive halfway across the State without seeing a single patrolman. Besides their patrol duties the men have to check on stolen cars, overweight trucks, remove articles from the highway, and assist motorists.

Before the end of this year, according to promises from the State highway department, another segment of the Interstate

Highway will be open. This will require more patrolmen. It is expected that by 1970 the entire 400-mile Interstate will be completed. This will add to the load of the patrol.

If Colonel Sanders says a larger patrol can put a "terrific dent" in the State's highway death toll he should be believed. He isn't going to gain anything from such action personally except the satisfaction of saving some lives, and that is the thing he has been most concerned with in the 26 years he has been a member of the patrol.

His is the only concrete suggestion made by any State official for reducing Nebraska's staggering highway death toll. Four hundred were killed in 1962 alone. This is a tremendous waste.

Experience of other States has demonstrated that strict law enforcement does help to reduce highway accidents and fatalities. There is no reason it won't in Nebraska.

Unless the plea of Colonel Sanders is approved by the legislature they will have only themselves to blame if the State's highway death toll isn't reduced. They have been given the solution and it is now their responsibility.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald, Feb. 17, 1963]

SAFETY PATROL CHIEF PLANNING TO RETIRE EFFECTIVE JUNE 13

The retirement of Col. C. J. Sanders as Chief of the Nebraska Safety Patrol on June 13 was announced indirectly Saturday in the letter of Mrs. Helen Greene in which she informed Governor Morrison of her immediate resignation as State Traffic Safety Coordinator.

"Colonel Sanders' retirement date has been common knowledge and I am assuming he is retiring, although I've not discussed a successor with him," Governor Morrison said.

Colonel Sanders confirmed his retirement plans Saturday night.

"Under our law it is mandatory that you retire on your 60th birthday and June 13 is it," Colonel Sanders said.

"I haven't been making much of an issue about it."

In her letter, Mrs. Greene recommended that the Governor appoint Capt. O. H. Witt to succeed Colonel Sanders.

Captain Witt "has done a truly outstanding job as head of the patrol's training and education program," Mrs. Greene said.

Colonel Sanders, 59, is 1 of the 14 members of the original force of 44 men still in the 25-year-old patrol. He was in the gasoline and oil business in Beatrice, Nebr., before joining the patrol. He was named chief in 1941, taking over from R. T. Schrien. The first chief was R. F. (Bub) Weller, onetime Nebraska football great.

In leaving her nonpaid position, Mrs. Greene recommended that the Governor appoint Thomas P. Ryan, chief of the accident records bureau, as her successor.

She said Mr. Ryan is "capable, thoroughly devoted to the cause of traffic safety, and highly qualified for the job."

In resigning, Mrs. Greene, mother of five, said "my first responsibility belongs to my family."

A native of Lincoln, she is the wife of William H. Greene, assistant manager of accounting at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. plant, Lincoln. The family lives at Greenwood.

During World War II she worked for the Office of War Information in San Francisco, Calif. She was a reporter on the Lincoln Journal from 1945 to 1947.

She was Nebraska publicity chairman of the Citizens for Kennedy organization during the presidential election. She was appointed January 26, 1961, to coordinate a State safety program.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal & Star, Feb. 17, 1963]

SANDERS RETIREMENT DATE SET; SUCCESSOR SPECULATED

June 13 has been set as retirement day for Col. C. J. Sanders, chief of the Nebraska Safety Patrol. Setting of the date touched off speculation as to his successor.

One name mentioned is that of Capt. O. H. Witt. It was advanced Saturday by Mrs. William H. Greene of Greenwood as she disclosed her own resignation as Gov. Frank Morrison's traffic safety coordinator.

Another well-informed source indicated that Capt. Dan Casey also should be considered among the leading candidates for the patrol's leadership.

In accepting Mrs. Greene's resignation Gov. Frank Morrison said her recommendations would be considered, but this was not interpreted as a commitment.

The Governor was in Grand Island Saturday night for a Democratic Party meeting, as was his chief administrative assistant, Norman Otto.

Reached there by telephone, Otto said he was positive Governor Morrison has not yet decided on a successor for Colonel Sanders, and indicated it would be some time before the decision is made.

Colonel Sanders, whose retirement is mandatory by age—he will be 60 on June 13, said he has three or four recommendations about his successor, but he said he has not yet discussed them with Governor Morrison. Colonel Sanders did not divulge who his recommendations to the Governor will be.

Captain Witt of Lincoln is the patrol's safety education and training chief.

Captain Casey, also of Lincoln, is commander of the patrol's headquarters troop here.

Like Colonel Sanders, both men have been with the patrol since it was established in 1937.

It was considered probable that Colonel Sanders' successor would be from among the patrol's ranks.

In addition to Captains Witt and Casey, other topmen in the patrol, and all captains are:

Vern Byler, H. F. Nash, M. T. Doyle, and W. P. Simon, all of Lincoln; D. R. Shearer of Omaha; E. L. Schottler of Norfolk; M. J. Wiley of Grand Island; and H. D. Robinson of North Platte.

Colonel Sanders, of 4531 South 43d, has been with the patrol since it was organized November 22, 1937.

The colonel started to work in Lincoln that year as a trooper. In 1938, he worked 4 months in Norfolk, then returned to Lincoln in 1939 and was made a sergeant.

In 1940, he was promoted to lieutenant and was then sent to Fort Crook, where he worked during construction of the bomber plant there.

In 1941, Sanders returned to Lincoln, was promoted to colonel, and named head of the patrol.

When the patrol was organized it had 44 members. Today it has 210.

Colonel Sanders and his wife, Maude, have two daughters—Patricia, of Lincoln, and Mrs. Joan Ketterer, of Scottsdale, Ariz., and two grandsons, C. J., and Bill, ages 4 and 7.

In announcing her resignation, Mrs. Greene also recommended that Tom Ryan, chief of the State accident records bureau, be her own successor.

Mrs. Greene said her first responsibility belongs with her family. She has been an unpaid volunteer in the coordinator's post.

Morrison commented that the State was deeply indebted to Mrs. Greene.

Mrs. Greene said Ryan was capable and thoroughly devoted to the cause of traffic safety and is highly qualified for the job.

Noting the Governor has committed himself to establishing an office of director of

safety, she wrote, "This is one of Nebraska's most pressing needs. The State of Nebraska will be much better off with a paid, full-time, well-qualified safety director than with the sporadic though well-meaning services of a volunteer worker."

Mrs. Greene said her only unfinished business is with the driver education bill and "the momentum we have already gained may carry it through."

Regarding Colonel Sanders' retirement, she urged that the line of succession should be kept within the organization.

Although Captain Witt is a Republican, she told the Governor, "I say that the patrol is above politics, and should be kept that way."

Captain Witt, she said, has done an outstanding job heading the patrol's training and education program.

"The breakthrough in the field of traffic safety will be accomplished not by something dramatic but by diligence, attention to detail, coordination, and the assurance that there is something that can be done," Mrs. Greene said.

"Maybe the new team of Ryan, Witt, and Morrison will accomplish just that."

NEED FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, research and development programs of the Federal Government have grown in the past two decades out of all proportion to any other segment of the national budget.

And they are threatening to outgrow our ability to manage them intelligently.

Just before World War II, the Government spent a mere \$75 million on science and technology. The figure proposed in the 1964 budget is just under \$15 billion.

This means that where a dollar was spent in 1940, there will be \$200 spent in 1964.

No one argues with the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. We still have vast frontiers to conquer. No one wants to put a price tag on the cure for cancer or the common cold or heart disease. No one fails to recognize the literal life-or-death seriousness of maintaining our military strength. No one underestimates the importance of our programs in space.

That is not the point. The point is whether the Congress is intelligently providing ample funds for all these efforts and whether the money is being spent in the most effective way.

There is strong reason to believe that the answer is "No" to both questions.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can testify that we do not have a sound basis for making the decisions which each year confront us and I am more than reasonably certain that those who administer the science and technology programs in the Government are seized with similar misgivings.

The fact is, as Dean Don K. Price of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard University has said:

Science has become the major establishment in the American political system; the only set of institutions for which tax funds are appropriated almost on faith.

Or, as Dr. Mortimer Taube, an eminent specialist in the field of Government research, told the Senate Committee on Government Operations last July:

Science in our time is more properly described as "big science" [which] makes necessary a reexamination of our administration of science.

Dr. Taube was testifying in behalf of a bill to create a Commission of Science and Technology. A similar bill, S. 816, was approved by the Senate on March 8 of this year.

For some reason, difficult for me to understand, administration spokesmen have been opposed to this legislation. The printed hearings on previous bills of this type show that time after time the committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], sought to pin down the administration witnesses as to the reason for their lack of enthusiasm about the bill. About the best answer he got was that we should wait and see how the newly formed Federal Council on Science and Technology worked out. Wait, they said. Wait and see.

Mr. President, the bill, S. 816, passed by the Senate last week, proposes no revolutionary change in our research and development programs. It simply calls for a Hoover-type commission which will undertake a comprehensive review of these programs and recommend to the President and the Congress what action, if any is indicated.

One scarcely needs such a commission to sense that something is terribly wrong. The papers with discouraging frequency report on mismanagement and questionable practices under the name of research. On Sunday, March 3, the Washington Post carried an article concerning the National Institutes of Health, which said in part:

The first sharp reaction in Congress to its own prodigality with the NIH research budget came only last year in two biting reports of a House Government Operations Subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, and an unsuccessful move in the Senate to hold down NIH appropriations to the level requested by the Kennedy administration.

The nub of the Fountain committee's indictment was its conclusion that "Congress has been overzealous in appropriating money for health research."

"The conclusion is inescapable," the report continued, "from a study of NIH's loose administrative practices, that the pressure for spending increasingly large appropriations has kept NIH from giving adequate attention to basic management problems."

The committee found that grant funds were used last year to buy more than \$1 million in office equipment and furniture, to pay travel bills totaling \$7.5 million (of which 15 percent was for trips abroad) and to bolster salaries of researchers above regular institutional scales.

In one case the Fountain group found that an NIH adviser collected a double salary of \$145.98 a day as an Institutes consultant and as head of a research firm financed primarily by NIH grants. NIH put his company in business, equipped it, and also paid a profit, the committee found.

In another instance, \$3,500 in grant funds, intended by law to foster medical research, were used to hire a Spanish ballet group at a professional conference in Washington.

A current example, not developed from the Fountain committee's files but which has raised eyebrows on Capitol Hill, is a 2-year, \$74,000 planning grant to a Columbia University professor of public health research to outline a history of American medical research, with emphasis on the history of NIH.

This summer the researcher plans a 6- or 7-week trip to Europe with his grant funds to study at close hand medical research in Scandinavia, France, and England. Next month the National Mental Health Advisory Council of NIH will act on his application for a new 5-year grant to advance the history project.

Such cases as these, while not typical, help to explain the growing unrest in Congress over whether the Institutes' ballooning grant program hasn't become a runaway proposition.

The grant system is one of the principal targets of NIH's congressional critics. This year nearly \$700 million will funnel through the grant program to universities and other non-Federal institutions, equivalent roughly to 80 cents out of every NIH dollar.

Institutes officials defend the system as a model of nonbureaucratic management of scientific enterprise, although under recent congressional prodding they have acknowledged that the funnel has sprung some leaks.

Deciding where these hundreds of millions of dollars go is the job of 46 NIH study sections in the various fields of medical science. A study section is a body of scientists sitting on a large body of money, upon which some members have ultimate designs.

Not infrequently the committees find themselves faced with grant requests from fellow committee members. In such cases it is up to the applicant to step out of the room and thus, symbolically at least, to purge the committee of conflicts of interest.

The great system is not without its critics among medical men. Louis Lasagna, associate professor of medicine at Johns Hopkins University and author of "The Doctor's Dilemma," made this observation about the system in his book.

"Once appointed to a study section, a scientist is eligible to become a full-fledged participant in the game of musical chairs played by a small minority of the country's researchers. One finds certain people moving from section to section, section to council, governmental to nongovernmental advisory bodies."

And 2 years ago, Dr. Freddy Homburger, Cambridge, Mass., cancer specialist and NIH grantee himself, charged at a closed appropriation hearing that the study section system has "led to formation of an oligarchy of scientists inside NIH who hold power over the majority of scientists who are on the outside."

He appealed for an independent study of the problem. But getting independent opinion, Congress has discovered, is itself a problem in the area of medical research.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, that we in the Congress, together with the public generally, have the seriously mistaken notion that any problem can be solved simply by drenching it with money, as one douses a fire with a bucket of water.

This, of course, is not the case, and the history of the medical grants to the National Institutes of Health is proof. Because of its embarrassing oversupply of congressional generosity, the NIH has been forced to find ways to spend its money. European trips and ballet dancers aside, those charged with spending our largess, have been forced to make grants to less-than-first-rate scientists

who, understandably, do less-than-first-rate work.

The real limitation, in many cases, is not money, but men. There is just so much that can be profitably done. We have actually promoted research in some pretty dubious areas because we insisted that the money be spent.

These were funds appropriated, as Dean Price said, "on faith."

There is not available to the Congress the professional assistance necessary to make the kind of decision we must make in appropriating these funds. I have asked the General Accounting Office, which serves the Congress so well in overseeing many Government programs, whether it is capable of providing this scientific assistance. The answer was no.

Mr. President, in its report to the Senate on an earlier version of S. 816, the Government Operations Committee said:

The inevitable conclusion was reached that it is the desire of the present administration to continue to center within the Executive Office of the President all control over civilian science operations. Unless legislative action is taken by the Congress to establish some medium through which reliable information and supporting technical data is made available to Congress by officials who are responsive to its needs, the committees of the Congress will continue to be denied access to facts and reliable information necessary to the legislative process in establishing policies in the fields of science and technology. Under the present policy, Congress is denied access to such information through the appointment of officials in the Executive Office of the President and Presidential advisory groups composed of the leading scientists and engineers throughout the country. These appointees are responsible only to the President and the field is preempted insofar as the Congress is concerned in its efforts to obtain reliable and factual information which is essential to the legislative branch if it is to perform its normal constitutional functions.

It is the conclusion of this committee, therefore, regardless of the recommendations of administration spokesmen, that there is a real need for a bipartisan commission to study the problems relating to the proposed establishment of a department of science and technology in order that the Congress may have access to officials who are responsive to its requirements, and provided with the necessary information to effect an equitable solution to the present problems relating to Federal science programs as may be determined by the President and the Congress.

As an essential first step in achieving these objectives, the committee recommends the enactment of S. 1851, so that the Congress and the President may have the benefit of the recommendations of qualified experts in the fields of science, engineering, and technology, upon which appropriate legislative action, directed toward the improvement of Federal science programs and operations, may be taken.

Mr. President, it is possible that the Senate may have the idea that my concern is limited to the Public Health Service, the Defense Department, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On the contrary, I am equally disturbed about the \$187 million in research funds sought by the Department of Agriculture, the \$122 million by the Department of the Interior, the \$105 million for the Department of Commerce.

And I am concerned about the overlapping of medical and health-related research among the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Science Foundation, no one of which is proposing to spend less than \$25 million in this one category, in all \$1.2 billion.

I wonder about the dozen-odd agencies who are working on meteorological research. Are they working together, at cross purposes, or do they overlap? Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know. And the present scheme offers little hope that I, or anyone else in the Congress, is likely to find out.

The same thing could be said of oceanography, where the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, and Treasury are cooperating—or is it competing—with the AEC, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Conversations with people knowledgeable in this field indicate, Mr. President, that the administration may be changing its mind about opposing the Hoover-type commission. I certainly hope so. This Nation badly needs a Commission on Science and Technology. And the Congress needs it, if it is not to lose altogether, its control over some \$15 billion of the people's money.

It is my earnest hope that the measure dealing with this subject will be enacted into law at an early date.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until Tuesday, March 19, at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Tuesday, March 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3188:

To be second lieutenant

Solomon, Eckwood H., Jr.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Andrews, Raymond G., XXXXXX
 Benson, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Benson, Roger R., XXXXXX
 Davis, Don M., XXXXXX
 Harvell, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 Kenney, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Naumann, Walter E., XXXXXX

Paquette, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Peters, Shelton V., XXXXXX
 Raley, Michael D., XXXXXX
 Sasai, Calvin Y., XXXXXX
 Shafer, Harold S., XXXXXX
 Snow, Edward F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Zebarth, Roger L., XXXXXX

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Tilden, Carol J., XXXX

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Dolson, James F. (MSC), XXXXXX

To be first lieutenant

Miles, Peter D. (MSC), XXXXXX
 Murphy, Joseph H., Jr. (MSC), XXXXXX

To be second lieutenant

Griffith, Ronald H., XXXXXX

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be captains

Bender, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Boehme, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Clancy, John D. S., XXXXXXXX
 Darden, Fred A., XXXXXXXX
 Doniphan, Vernon G., XXXXXXXX
 Ellis, Warren H., XXXXXXXX
 Farrell, James J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Fiesler, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 George, Donald B., XXXXXXXX
 Giese, William, XXXXXXXX
 Gordon, Robert L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hamner, Charles T., XXXXXXXX
 Hayes, Aldric M., XXXXXXXX
 Hendrick, Edward J., XXXXXXXX
 Howard, Lonnie T., XXXXXXXX
 Hussey, Donald P., XXXXXXXX
 Jorgensen, Norman E., XXXXXXXX
 Kells, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Kunkel, Edwin R., XXXXXXXX
 Labrozzi, Anthony, XXXXXXXX
 Lewis, Glenn W., XXXXXXXX
 Lillis, Francis X., XXXXXXXX
 Lundquist, Donald C., XXXXXXXX
 Mason, Phillip H., XXXXXXXX
 Mattson, Melvin R., XXXXXXXX
 McKee, Jona, XXXXXXXX
 Morley, Thomas L., XXXXXXXX
 Oswald, Philip L., XXXXXXXX
 Phillips, Fred E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Rathburn, Thomas K., XXXXXXXX
 Schmale, William O., XXXXXXXX
 Shattuck, William M., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Roy M., XXXXXXXX
 Wagner, Rudy J., XXXXXXXX
 Wells, Lester H., XXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Charles F., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants

Balberde, Alexander, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Blair, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Bradshaw, Charles W., XXXXXXXX
 Brokaw, Francis L., XXXXXXXX
 Cook, Donald M., XXXX
 Courts, Phillip E., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Kenneth M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Downs, George M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gordon, Jack T., XXXXXXXX
 Gordon, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX
 Grove, Robert N., XXXX
 Hankins, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Heaton, Harold K., XXXXXXXX
 Hoagland, Jackson, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Henry O., III, XXXXXXXX
 Kannady, Donald R., XXXXXXXX
 Lynch, David J., XXXXXXXX
 McNamara, Vincent E., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Sharon W., XXXXXXXX
 Moithen, Theodore J., XXXXXXXX
 Ogden, George C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Peate, Laurence R., XXXXXXXX
 Phelan, Frank J., XXXXXXXX

Riley, Larry L., XXXXXXXX
 Schuler, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Scott, John O., XXXXXXXX
 Simmons, Jerry W., XXXX
 Stokes, Orville P., XXXXXXXX
 Wallace, Woodrow W., Jr., XXXX

To be second lieutenants

Aldrich, Harold B., III, XXXXXXXX
 Carver, William G., XXXXXXXX
 Denny, James B., XXXXXXXX
 Farley, George P., XXXXXXXX
 Hyde, Thomas A., III, XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Ben A., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Lidge O. J., XXXXXXXX
 Liewert, Karl H., XXXXXXXX
 Medley, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX
 Moody, Robert D., XXXXXXXX
 Powers, Gary R., XXXXXXXX
 Reynolds, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Robertson, Robert S., XXXXXXXX
 Robison, Thomas W., XXXXXXXX
 Schaffler, Albert B., XXXXXXXX
 Scott, Kenneth G., XXXXXXXX
 Sturdivant, Clifford R., XXXXXXXX
 Tierney, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Wenz, Henry F., XXXXXXXX

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3291, 3292, 3293, and 3294:

To be major, Medical Corps

Greene, Calvin E., XXXXXXXX

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Hagopian, Jacob, XXXXXXXX

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Street, Dorothy R., XXXX

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Foley, Mary A., XXXXXXXX
 Locke, Ruth A., XXXXXXXX
 McCausland, Muriel J., XXXXXXXX
 Mizelle, Anne S., XXXXXXXX

To be captains, Chaplain

Lucky, Carl E. L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McCullagh, John P., XXXXXXXX
 Moskowitz, Seymour, XXXXXXXX

To be captain, Dental Corps

Neaverth, Elmer J., Jr., XXXXXXXX

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Bright, Fred, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Trall, Sebort L., XXXXXXXX

To be captains, Medical Corps

Abramson, Ira J., XXXXXXXX
 Corby, Donald G., XXXXXXXX
 Culp, Nell W., XXXXXXXX
 Ledbetter, René B., XXXXXXXX
 Metzger, Marshall T., XXXXXXXX
 Olson, Hardin E., XXXXXXXX
 Rowland, Wade R., XXXXXXXX
 Seaton, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Spaulding, Harry S., Jr., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Castleman, Glynn K., XXXXXXXX
 Heer, Edith J., XXXXXXXX
 McLoughlin, Audre J., XXXXXXXX
 Scheerer, Marjorie J., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Prout, Gordon R., XXXXXXXX
 Reswik, George V., XXXXXXXX
 Van Meter, James W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Wilson, David L., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Barringer, Michael L., XXXXXXXX
 Burr, Donald C., XXXXXXXX
 Caras, Thomas S., XXXXXXXX
 Choolitch, Melvin P., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Robert N., XXXXXXXX
 Harshaw, William G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hays, Leonard L., XXXXXXXX
 Kaplan, Gerald, XXXXXXXX
 Mani, Carl J., XXXXXXXX

Ruymann, Frederick B., XXXXXXXX
 Schwindt, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Severance, Richard C., XXXXXXXX
 Sills, Theron G., XXXXXXXX
 Slaughter, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Henry I., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Samuel G., XXXXXXXX
 Stephenson, Jackie D., XXXXXXXX
 Volpe, Joseph A., XXXXXXXX
 Waldron, Frank D., XXXXXXXX
 Wills, William R., Jr., XXXXXXXX

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Blachly, Carol A., XXXXXXXX
 Saunders, Martha E., XXXXXXXX

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Bradford, Jackie E. Mortensen, Eugene P.
 Carlson, Ronald O. J. Nadig, Carroll C.
 Cottman, Robert E. L. Olson, Jimmy L.
 Greene, James W. Redden, William L., Jr.
 Hanson, Larry L. Starr, Gerald R.
 Hardgrave, Newt L. Trader, Michael W.
 Hula, Roger P., II Vorpahl, Kenneth W.
 Johnson, Vernon E., Jr. Watts, Stephen S.
 Lawrence, Frank M. Zigarmi, Andrea, III
 Morgan, John W., Jr.

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adler, Kenneth H. Carlile, Thomas R.
 Ahrens, Alfred J. Carlson, Paul D.
 Allen, Harold F. Cawley, Thomas J.
 Anastas, John M. Chaney, Martin L.
 Andersen, Ronald J. Chien, Kenneth
 Anderson, Carlton L. Clark, Francis M., Jr.
 Anderson, Randall J. Clark, James F.
 Andre, David J. Clark, Robert L.
 Appuzzo, Louis R. Clifford, David M.
 Armstrong, William B. Cloud, Earl W.
 Arrington, Theron R. Clouse, Charles L.
 Atkins, George M., Jr. Cone, Fred M., Jr.
 Aubuchon, James M. Conrad, Robert S.
 Audemberge, Robert Conti, Thomas L.
 L. Conwell, Gary K.
 Baker, Alfred W. Cook, Stephen W.
 Barrett, Paul S. Coonfield, Derrill G.
 Barrick, Charles R. Cosby, James W.
 Barylski, James E. Creasy, Joseph L.
 Baumann, Bruce W. Crisp, William G.
 Beaupre, Christopher A. Cronise, Ronald V.
 A. Cummings, Peter M.
 Bell, Clarence D., Jr. Cunningham, Frank, III
 Bennett, Jerry C. David, James R.
 Bishop, Alexius O. Davis, Harley C.
 Bitter, David D. Davis, James L., Jr.
 Bleam, William D. Day, Doel D.
 Blevens, Andrew DeHayes, Daniel W., Jr.
 Bolden, Frank A. Demarest, Alfred A., Jr.
 Brandon, Lawson W., Jr.
 Brant, Arthur Denmon, James L.
 Brown, Elwyn L. Diamond, Richard J.
 Brown, Harvey E. Dobras, Victor E., II
 Brown, Russell W. Dodge, Ira D., III
 Brunel, Pierre E. Drake, Francis D.
 Bryant, Earl W. Drescher, Donald R.
 Brysen, Frank D. Dysart, James E.
 Buchanan, Samuel J. Ederly, David E.
 Buchly, Howard L. Elfried, Gary
 Buelow, Edward H., Jr. Eilbeck, Edward L.
 Eschweiler, Leonard W.
 Buffardi, Louis N., Jr. Estes, James F., Jr.
 Buntington, John D. Ewers, Rayburn O.
 Bunting, Josiah, III Butler, Alvin L.
 Byrd, Robert L. Fenwick, Victor J., Jr.
 Caldwell, Marion L., Jr. Flynn, Michael J.
 Fore, Calvin R.

Forrest, Harold R. Kramer, Charles H. R.
 Forrester, Philip R. Kramer, William J.
 Fortner, John P. Krannawitter, James C., Jr.
 Foster, Edward T., Jr. Kraus, Kenneth L.
 Frasche, Robert M. Krewson, David S., Jr.
 Freeman, Lawrence W. Kripowicz, Robert S.
 Fried, Page G., III Kubek, Donald R.
 Fulford, Ernest L. Kuypers, John C.
 Fulmer, Frank E. Lackman, Albert L.
 Fygi, Eric J. Lacy, John J., Jr.
 Gaddis, Thomas W. La Forge, William G.
 Garner, Bruce C. Lanahan, George W.
 Garvais, Richard A. La Rocco, Angelo A.
 Gee, Bobby J. Lawhon, Edward H.
 Geoghegan, John L. Ledwin, Norman A., Jr.
 Gillespie, James J., Jr. Leigh, Fredric H.
 Glantz, David M. Lenhart, Michael E.
 Godfrey, Thomas G. Letson, Laurence R.
 Goetz, Robert C. Liberti, Joseph C.
 Gold, John E., Jr. Lineweaver, Robert N., III
 Goldberg, Sherwood D. Little, John H.
 Goodridge, Clair L. Little, Joseph R.
 Gorman, Francis J. Locker, William J.
 Gragg, Robert L. Loop, Carlos A., Jr.
 Graning, Harold M., Jr. Lorenzo, William E., Jr.
 Graves, Harold R. Luther, Herbert H.
 Graves, Scott A. Lychmanenko, Eugene
 Green, Harry G., Jr. Mack, Victor A.
 Gregory, Stephen E., Jr. Mackey, David R.
 Griffin, James A. Mandagaran, Gilbert F.
 Grimsley, Turner E. Mansi, Leo J., Jr.
 Gross, Graham L. Marchant, Robert D.
 Gruber, Lewis A. Marcy, Richard C., Jr.
 Gulstrand, Rudolph E., Jr. Martin, Gerald A.
 Gurecki, John J., Jr. Maslinski, Donald R.
 Gustafson, Melvyn D. Mayberry, Robert L.
 Hacker, Gary L. McCarley, Michael M.
 Hagman, J. Michael McDewitt, Coleman J., Jr.
 Hall, Robert C. McDonald, Daniel W., Jr.
 Hamm, Michael R. McFarlane, Thomas C.
 Hancock, Louis A. McGinnis, James J., Jr.
 Hansen, Albert, III McGrath, Vincent A.
 Hanson, Charles T. McIntyre, Peter E.
 Hardt, Jerome D. McKee, David L.
 Harrison, James M. McLeod, Joel E., Jr.
 Harvey, John R. McLoughlin, Robert E.
 Haselton, Mark B. Melin, Jeffrey N.
 Hayes, William G., III Meyer, James F.
 Heinig, William J. Meyers, Jerrold B.
 Hendriks, Warren K., Jr. Miller, Henderson I.
 Hinkle, Carl V., Jr. Miller, William G.
 Hitchcock, Gary Minor, Gary L.
 Hocevar, August E. Mitchell, Charles M.
 Hoebeke, Terrall A. Mitchell, William F.
 Hoeffcker, Wilmer A., Jr. Modarelli, Robert O.
 Hoggard, Patrick L. Montgomery, William A.
 Holland, Michael C. Mooney, Philip D.
 Holtry, Preston W. Morrison, Fred K.
 Homan, Richard P. Mueller, Paul G.
 Hubing, James N. Nanney, Joe W.
 Huff, Keith M. Necessary,
 Iannarino, Thomas E. Kenneth A. J.
 Ippolito, Peter J. Nevers, David G.
 Irwin, Arthur E. Noble, Donald H.
 Jackson, Ernest R. Noto, Samuel R.
 Jacobs, Paul A. O'Laughlin,
 Jandras, John S. Michael F.
 Jeffress, Edwin B. Oldfield, John F.
 Jenkins, Kenneth E. Olds, William K. S.
 Jennings, Logan R. Olson, Walter E., Jr.
 Jessen, Otto W. O'Malley, Thomas E.
 Jones, James M. Ostovich, Rudolph, III
 Jordan, Kenneth M. Pacelli, Joseph A.
 Keath, Medford E., Jr. Pansze, Arthur J., Jr.
 Keim, David W. Parkin, Curtis W.
 Kemp, Tommy W. Pastore, Joseph M., Jr.
 Kessel, Mark Patterson, Daniel J.
 Kindred, Jon D. Piechocki, John R.
 Kinker, James L. Pilsch, Martin C., Jr.
 Kjelson, Martin A., III Pitts, Willard C.
 Klein, James W.
 Kneidler, Harry L., III
 Koga, Malcolm T.
 Kohler, Mark H.

Plaxe, Jack R. Takata, Alvin M.
 Pocreva, Michael A. Talbott, Charlie Y., Jr.
 Pond, David W. Talley, Thomas A.
 Powell, William E. Tateyama, Joseph T.
 Powers, George E. Terry, Millard D.
 Przybylski, Robert J. Thomas, Michael T.
 Reid, John F. Tilelli, John H., Jr.
 Renaud, Timothy J. Trainer, Charles D.
 Rendeiro, Antonio C. Trotter, Kenneth E.
 Reynolds, Roger D. Troxler, Robert C.
 Riccobono, James C. Tucker, James E.
 Rice, Richard E. Urban, Gerald G.
 Richter, Otto, Jr. Uyenoyama, Dennis H.
 Riley, William W. Valencia, Romolo
 Roark, Stanley L. Vande Hel, Thomas F.
 Robins, David S. Vanderploog, Paul J.
 Robinson, James A. Robison, Donald E.
 Ross, Norman E., Jr. Venokur, Steven M.
 Rust, David H. Verstege, Keith J.
 Ryan, Kevin M. Vitasak, George P.
 Sagerser, Roy P. Vlasak, Walter R.
 Salzer, James R. Wagner, Dale N.
 Sander, Lawrence W. Wall, Thomas F.
 Sasaki, Raymond N. Wallace, Terrence M.
 Savage, George N., III Walsh, William F., Jr.
 Savells, Jerald O. Walstad, George H.
 Schmidt, Lawrence G. Walton, Charles M.
 Schuetze, Irving P. Ward, Stephen R.
 Schwartz, William W. Waters, John K., Jr.
 Scott, William W. Watson, Charles H., III
 Sitter, Laurance F. Wells, William A.
 Skender, Louis E. Whipple, Robert E.
 Sklerkowski, Paul White, Perry S.
 Skinrood, Norman A., Jr. Whitley, Bobby
 Smallwood, Edward K. Wicks, John R.
 Smith, Freddie G. Williams, Gomer R.
 Smith, Gardner W. Williams, William J.
 Snetzer, Michael A. Wilson, John C., Jr.
 Snook, Larry Wilson, Leslie E.
 Spessard, Richard L. Wojciechowski, John J.
 Spring, Michael C. Womack, Charles H.
 Sprinkle, Edgar E., III Wood, Samuel E.
 Standley, Warren R. Worthington, Douglas L.
 Stanley, Douglas S. Wykle, Kenneth R.
 Steele, Charles T. Yoshimura, John P.
 Stephens, Jeffrey L. Younger, William E., Jr.
 Sterrett, John D., III Yurachek, John P.
 Stocks, Robert B. Strauss, Robert E., Jr. Zeltner, Richard L.
 Strook, Arthur H., II Zentis, Joseph J.
 Swarouth, John E. Zinni, Gabriel J.
 Taft, John M.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15, 1963:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Richard D. Fitzgibbon, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri for the term of 4 years.

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for a term of 4 years.

Jack T. Stuart, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1956.

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1963.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1969.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admirals

Capt. James D. Craik.
Capt. Louis M. Thayer, Jr.

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Academy as an instructor with the permanent grade indicated:

To be lieutenant

Frank S. Kapral.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants

James H. Blumer Archibald J. Patrick
Charles W. Mathisson R. Lawrence Swanson
Bruce I. Williams James Collins

George A. Maul Ralph J. Land
Robert A. Trauschke

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Archibald J. Patrick John W. Bricker
R. Lawrence Swanson Donald J. Florwick
James Collins Charles K. Paul
George A. Maul Dee E. Kimbell
Robert A. Trauschke Dewaine Seets
Ralph J. Land Andrew Tczap
Francis D. Moran Sigmund R. Petersen
Robert E. Lushene

To be ensigns

Kenneth V. Marovich David L. Des Jardins, Jr.
Edward P. Cline Norment A. Barnes, Jr.
Jeffrey G. Carlen

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Vice President's "Challenge to Americans"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 12, 1963, the Vice President of the United States, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, spoke before the National Advertising Council at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C.

His remarks were titled "Challenge to Americans."

His remarks are so brilliantly eloquent that they deserve the attention, not only of those members of the National Advertising Council who heard the Vice President personally, but of the Members of the Senate, and Americans everywhere.

In his prepared text, Vice President JOHNSON said:

As a nation, we are challenged. As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

Since I have been a member of this Senate I have had the honor of serving with the Vice President, not only since he has been Vice President, but when he was the majority leader of the Senate. When he was summoned, I know personally he has searched for the answers which would keep "America free and the home of the brave." But whatever position of service to America he has held, the Vice President, has been, to paraphrase his words, in this order, a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat. He has never been partisan at a time when the need called for a patriot.

Because he is a patriot and a statesman, and because he is a Democrat, last and always, he is able to bring to the country leadership for Americans in his

speech to the National Advertising Council which is so worthy of us all. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS

(Address by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, National Advertising Council dinner, Presidential Room, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963)

On this occasion, others of the administration have spoken of the programs and policies by which our Government seeks to meet the challenges to our system. For my part, I want to speak of our system itself, and of the challenge it presents to us for maintaining the effective and responsible functioning of our Government.

Whatever our programs, whatever our policies, if our country is to succeed, if our cause is to prevail, if the challenge to Americans is to be met, our political system, the system by which we govern ourselves, must function effectively and responsibly.

I wish that I might objectively say that such is now the case, beyond all doubt. But no honest observer, no matter what his persuasion, could be entirely content with the performance of our political system at this period of our history.

In the arena of national public affairs, we are debating more and resolving less. On issue after issue, our energies are exerted more to frustrate answers than to find them. Inaction is exalted by many as a greater virtue than decision. If we are not defaulting our basic national responsibilities, the question does arise whether we may not be forfeiting or compromising valuable national opportunities.

I do not believe that any discussion of our national programs, policies, and purposes would be complete without a full and frank acknowledgment of this problem, its causes, and its extensive implications.

Let me say that my interest in this is the product of my own experience, service, and convictions. The office I now hold is the one constitutional office which exists solely to assure the orderly and effective functioning of our system. Before becoming Vice President of the United States, I was, as leader of the majority party in the Senate, confronted with unique responsibilities for helping to maintain the functioning of our system during the longest period of divided party responsibility in our Nation's history.

This is a subject with which I have lived closely, and about which I feel strongly. While I intend to speak candidly in these remarks, I mean only to speak constructively, remembering that I am a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat, in that order, only and always.

Your council is now engaged in an effective and intelligent campaign to bring home the "challenge to Americans." I congratulate you on the quality and contribution of that effort.

As a Nation, we are challenged.

As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

But I believe both our understanding and our response begin with a clear understanding of our Nation's position in the world. Challenged as we are, we still do not live in an America besieged, an America beset, an America grimly imperiled.

The vital truth of this last half of the 20th century is that while we are challenged, we are also the challengers, challenging all the oppressors and oppressions of humankind.

Since time began, the weak have been at the mercy of the strong; the peaceful have been the prey of the aggressor; the vanquished have been victimized by the victors; the poverty of the world's masses has been of concern only to the poor themselves. Disease has been the concern only of the sick. Human despair and deprivation have mattered only to the despairing and deprived.

We of America has been the first to challenge this age-old order of human affairs and we have challenged it successfully. We have demonstrated that men can be strong without being selfish, can become powerful without becoming unprincipled, can be victors without being vandals, can be saviors without being spoilsmen.

The fruits of this are many.

Of the 50 nations which have gained their independence in the postwar years, not one has chosen to ally with the Communist tyranny.

Nations which have warred against one another for centuries have in these times joined together in mutual alliances and binding friendships.

The example of the political and economic unity of our 50 States is reshaping the future of virtually every continent where men are free.

We can with good cause believe that a new age is coming in the affairs of man, and we can with sure knowledge know that it is

an age which had its beginnings and takes its inspiration from these shores.

It is against this standard that we must today, and always, test and measure the performance of our system. It is not enough for our system merely to guard the present, although that it must surely do. It is imperative that our system continue to challenge the future.

This imperative is more than any other the special burden of this period of our national affairs and public policy. We have over the past 20 years committed our national resources and our national efforts to programs which have succeeded. Because of that success, not because of failure, as some would have it, we must now respond to new conditions and new challenges with new programs.

Because containment of Communist aggression did succeed in Europe and the Middle East and Southeast Asia, we are now faced with the Communist effort to escape that containment by penetrating into the Western Hemisphere.

Because economic assistance did succeed in the Atlantic community, we must now deal with upright allies instead of prostrate friends.

Because independence fashioned after our own example did succeed in Asia and Africa, we must at the United Nations hear many more voices, the voices of men speaking for themselves, as we do, instead of being spoken for by others.

By every measure, the tide runs with us. But if "the winds and waves are always on the side of the ablest navigators," we must at this period adjust our sails to hold true to our course. That is the clear and compelling necessity of our public policy at home as abroad.

But we can question, in fact we must question, whether our system is now functioning effectively and responsibly to accomplish this.

In the sum of our national experience, success is the predominant reality, success domestically, success internationally. Mistakes have been made. But we stand virtually alone as a nation which has never experienced a mistake fatal to its national existence, integrity or independence. Yet, despite this record, the predominant theme of our public discussions of national policy is talk of failure rather than success. Our system is disgoring much afterthought about what we should not have done and offering little forethought about what can be done.

In this context, the example of Cuba is obvious. But it is a fitting commentary on the problem that most of the discussion on Cuba has obscured two essential points:

First, that our system cannot function effectively if it is paralyzed by irresponsible conflicts which tear down confidence in our system; and

Second, that our system cannot function responsibly if we disregard the purpose and importance of the constitutional concept of the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government.

On these matters, I speak from intimate personal experience. During the period to which I have referred, when I served as majority leader of the Senate, the majority position in Congress was held by one party, the executive position was held by another party. Such a division could not have occurred or have been tolerated in any other government, representative or totalitarian.

What was impressed indelibly upon me during that period was that either party or both parties had the power then to bring the functioning of our system to a halt, and, in so doing, to collapse the strength as well as the hope of the cause of freedom. Furthermore, in that same situation, those same consequences could have come had

the congressional majority sought to transgress and usurp the powers of the Executive.

I do not recall these circumstances to give or claim any partisan credit. It required the patriotism of two parties, not one, for divided government to work at all. My purpose is to make these points:

1. In the design of our system irresponsible partisanship, and irresponsible partisanship alone, holds the power of paralyzing and immobilizing our Government.

2. Our Constitution did not base itself upon the concept of an opposition party with the sole duty to oppose. On the contrary, our system is based on a concept of the duty to decide by full and thoughtful debate, and our system will not function if that duty is defaulted.

3. In parliamentary systems, issues make the election calendar. In our system, election calendars make the issues the partisans. Thus, we must seek to avoid the hazard that the issues we debate will be false or obsolete or worse.

4. When we allow the constitutional separation of powers between legislative and executive to fall into disarray, we invite the serious danger of the subversion of our system. There must be no back door to the American Government in its dealings with foreign governments or nationals or we will not long be masters of our own house. Under our Constitution, the Executive and only the Executive speaks for and acts for this Nation in relations abroad—and no partisan cause can justify disregard of this standard.

5. Finally, I would make the point that if our system is to function successfully, the central focus of partisan attack cannot continue to be the people's confidence in the institution of the Presidency of the United States.

No head of state in the world bears more responsibility than the President of this Nation, yet none has less free exercise of authority. As an individual, he is subject to law. His vetoes can be overridden. His appointments can be rejected. He is Commander in Chief but he cannot raise armies and fleets on his own authority. These provisions are in the Constitution and we would not have it otherwise. They are legitimate and based upon the studied consideration of men of wisdom.

But beyond the Constitution, there has grown up in our times an inordinate preoccupation with frustrating the Chief Executive, thwarting his recommendations, controlling his course by weakening or destroying the public confidence in him. Beyond the parties themselves, this is an activity indulged by many effective segments of our society, business and labor, races and religions, regions and States. And it has made little difference whether the President has been Republican or Democrat, Dwight Eisenhower or John F. Kennedy.

I am a partisan. I have practiced my partisanship with enthusiasm in proper partisan seasons. But I have never, and will never, seek to destroy before the Nation or the world the confidence of free men in the institution upon whom the success of freedom's cause must depend.

I speak as I do tonight because, as I have said, it is imperative that our system challenge the future.

If we are to succeed in the future as we have in the past, we must in many realms of public policy cease to do what there is no longer need for us to be doing and begin to do what we should already have done.

We must not permit partisanship to paralyze us.

We must not permit conservatism defined 40 years ago or liberalism defined 30 years ago to prevent us from defining for ourselves the progressiveness, prudence and patriotism required for these times today.

We must not permit the search for fallures to lead us away from the exploitation of our successes.

We must not permit the valid purpose of preventing a single office from becoming too powerful to be perverted so that we cause the whole Nation to become too powerless.

We must not allow the separation of powers within our system to be subverted and thus invite the subversion of our freedoms as well.

The tides of these times run with us. That revolution of freedom which began on these shores still challenges and changes the world. The challenge to Americans is to understand how great and how successful is their cause, and that they serve that cause by being patriots before they are partisans.

In partisanship, as in patriotism, there must be standards by which responsible men abide. If patriotism knows no season, partisanship must never forget its season. America will not be served by a perpetual and unending campaign for power between its partisans who contest with each other for the seizure of power rather than the resolution of issues.

In our policies, foreign and domestic, this is a time for reform.

It is no less a time for reform in our politics, and in those free institutions through which our system functions. This is important work and vital work for us all, and none is more important now. For if a house divided against itself cannot stand, a system contending against itself for the sake of contention alone cannot succeed.

The thoughts I have expressed here tonight are not new with me. They are thoughts that I have expressed when I was the Democratic leader under a Republican President. The same thoughts, I believe, are valid now that we have a Democratic President and must always be valid.

There is a legitimate role for partisanship in our society. We must and should have partisanship because issues must be debated, must be discussed from all points of view, if they are to be resolved.

The danger—and this I say to my colleagues of both parties is that we will debate issues not to solve the problems of our country but solely to solve the problems of the next election. The danger is compounded when we debate just to find areas of disagreement and to ignore the areas of agreement.

I have always sought the areas of agreement. Without such an effort, our society cannot long endure because we live under government by consent and unless we know what we consent to, effective government is impossible.

As patriotic Americans, let us seek out the areas of agreement upon which we can preserve our freedoms. Let us debate those issues upon which we disagree with dignity, with candor, and with the objective of finding a solution.

On that bedrock, our freedoms will endure. The united voice of free men will solve not only the problems of the next election but the problems of the next generation and the words "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable" will remain a living reality for all time.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is easy to get excited over Federal expenditures, the national debt, and this country's unbalanced budget.

It is very difficult, however, to explain these problems so that they can be understood by most of the people. I believe there was delivered recently a speech which did a great deal toward explaining these problems and toward attempting to eliminate much of the emotionalism tied up with them.

This was the very interesting speech delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] on March 11, before a dinner group at the Brookings Institution. As a good explanation of some of the basic facts which have to do with this Government's fiscal policies, I recommend the address by Senator HARTKE and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR HARTKE DISCUSSES BUDGET IN BROOKINGS INSTITUTION APPEARANCE

Let's do away with the budget. After all, it is the subject of plenty of adverse comment. After all, as some claim, it is out of control, out of date, and out of balance.

Then let's do away with the Federal debt. After all, as some claim, the Federal debt is too high, dangerous, a burden on us, a millstone around our children's necks.

To you experts, this may sound like a lot of tomfoolery. Yet to most Americans, this is what they hear and some believe about Federal fiscal affairs. I am sure each of you recognizes these slogans for what they are worth. But of all the affairs of Government the matter of fiscal affairs is least susceptible to slogans. It is a matter of simple book-keeping and difficult economics. It is difficult to explain in simple terms.

We are a big country with awesome responsibilities and tremendous obligations. The budget is an estimate of what these responsibilities and obligations are costing.

In estimating the budget we attempt to judge the future economic conditions using past conditions as guidelines. What are some of these basic past facts and conditions? We have now had about 2 years since the last recession trough. During this time the gross national product rose \$61 billion; personal income increased by \$43 billion, and corporate profits increased by \$11 billion. These figures are quite remarkable for a period of about 24 months and in general language would be called times of prosperity. Output of steel mills is on the rise at its highest level since April of 1962. The auto industry is on the verge of near record sales, and auto sales last year were generally exceptionally great. The first 20 days of February ran far ahead of a year ago and are not far under the level of February 1955, the year of recordmaking sales. Retail sales are very brisk, following a record year. Although unemployment is a nagging problem, the truth is that employment is at an alltime high.

Yet, the President has complained about a lagging economy and business is complaining about a profit squeeze, what they want is more "pep" in the prosperous times we are having.

The cynics might easily look at the condition of our business and economy and say: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

The truth is that the rate of growth in the United States has been good but it should have been better. More than that, the growth in 1962 was slower than in 1961 and there is no reason to expect it to accelerate in 1963. Therefore it is deemed desirable to stimulate the economy.

One method of stimulation is a tax cut. In considering enactment of a tax cut, it is

necessary to give an estimate of some future economic conditions. Let's look at the future. The prosperity of the past 2 years is probably going to continue. The gross national product reached an all-time high of \$554 billion in the calendar year of 1962, more important, the fourth quarter of 1962 brought the gross national product to an annual rate of \$562 billion. It will probably go close to \$580 billion in 1963. Here again, if we follow the reasoning of the cautious cynics, the question would again be proper: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

In the field of corporate profits it is expected that we will reach still more record-breaking heights by increasing another \$2 billion. Personal income is expected to increase by about \$20 billion. These almost staggering prosperous figures are enough to warm the breasts of all even the gloom and doom prophets.

The truth, as I see it, is in a very simple proposition: "Times are good."

Now that times are good, why should we have a budget with a deficit? Well, in fact the choice this year is really not a deficit with a tax cut or a deficit without a tax cut. The fact is there will be a deficit either way. Now for the sake of the partisans, those of the Eisenhower years must first meet two basic facts:

1. The Eisenhower years produced a deficit of over \$22 billion for 8 years, and no peacetime deficit has ever exceeded the one Eisenhower had in 1959 in the amount of approximately \$13 billion.

2. Congress cut the budgets of President Eisenhower by \$20 billion. If this had not been done we would have had a total deficit of over \$42 billion for the 8 Eisenhower years.

Now to calm the waters in regard to all expenditures, it is normal that Congress usually cuts the budget submitted by the President. This statement is true, although the wisdom of such action is frequently challenged.

The fact that times are good and that we are going to have a deficit point up a truism, the Nation which leads the world is going to have excellent times in order to continue our role as world leader. The proposed budget, submitted by President Kennedy, recognizes this international responsibility. In this budget the following costs of Government are increased:

1. Defense expenditures are proposed to be increased by \$2.4 billion.

2. Space expenditures are proposed to be increased by \$1.8 billion.

3. Interest costs will be up \$900 million. All other costs combined are proposed to be less than last year.

With this background I would like to briefly approach some of the more common questions concerning our fiscal policy for next year.

IS GOVERNMENT SPENDING GOING OUT OF CONTROL?

All levels of Government have been subject to sharp pressures for increased expenditures during the postwar period as our population has grown, as wages and prices have risen, and as demands for improved governmental services have expanded. Since 1948, State and local government expenditures have more than trebled and Federal expenditures for nondefense purposes, including a rapidly expanding level of grants-in-aid to State and local governments, have only doubled. The Federal Government has also borne a sharply increased burden in the areas of national defense, international affairs, and space.

However, the economy has been growing at a slightly faster percentage rate than Government spending. As a result, Federal budget expenditures today bear about the same relationship to gross national product (total value of all goods and services pro-

duced in this country in 1 year) as they did in the latter 1950's:

Ratio of Federal budget expenditures to GNP

| Fiscal year: | Percent |
|----------------------|---------|
| 1955..... | 17.1 |
| 1956..... | 16.2 |
| 1957..... | 15.9 |
| 1958..... | 16.2 |
| 1959..... | 17.2 |
| 1963 (estimate)..... | 16.7 |

Apart from defense, space, and interest, budget expenditures between 1961 and 1964 will increase less than they did between 1958 and 1961.

WHAT ABOUT INCREASING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT?

Since the war, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government has grown less rapidly than the population and much less rapidly than State and local government employment:

| [In millions] | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Calendar year | U.S. population | State and local government employment | Federal civilian employment in executive branch |
| 1948..... | 146.6 | 3.8 | 2.0 |
| 1962..... | 186.6 | 6.8 | 2.5 |
| Percent increase.. | 27 | 79 | 25 |

One force making for increased employment is simply the steady increase in our population, which puts an added burden on many programs. At the end of 1964, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government will be 189,000 higher than it was a decade earlier; yet the percentage increase in Government employment over this period will be less than the percentage increase in population.

Federal civilian employment under the 1964 budget provides for the same number of people to serve every 100 persons in our populations as was true when the present administration took office, a smaller ratio than prevailed 10 years ago.

Federal civilian employment is actually lower today than it was in 1952, while State and local government employment over the same period has increased 67 percent.

CAN WE EVER HOPE TO ACHIEVE A BALANCED BUDGET UNDER PRESENT POLICIES?

Yes, there is always hope. Realistically, the experience of the past generation shows that as long as we are operating under a restrictive tax program there is little hope to achieve a balanced budget. The present tax policy is based on war taxes.

It is restrictive. We should remove the wartime tax shackles. Then the law of supply and demand could again operate more closely to normal. This would increase purchasing power, increase production, reduce unemployment and increase profits. The net result would be an expanded economy, a greater prosperity, increased tax revenue, and a balanced budget.

SHOULDN'T ANY TAX REDUCTION BE OFFSET BY A CUT IN EXPENDITURES?

In the first place, Congress will more than likely cut the amount proposed in the President's budget. But to merely cut expenditures without considering the consequences would be plain stupid. Cutting expenditures is a desirable aim of all government. But you cannot increase our Army and cut the cost; you can't go half way to the moon; you can't default on our Government debts; you can't cut generalities, you have to be specific. Little attention need be given to the individual who speaks of general reduction in expenditures unless they are specific.

WON'T THE DEFICIT OF NEARLY \$12 BILLION ANTICIPATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964 TEND TO CAUSE INFLATION?

Under present economic conditions there need be little fear that the President's tax program and the deficit for fiscal year 1964 will tend to cause inflation. The law of supply and demand are such that inflation comes only when there is full employment and full production. Today, there is still unemployment and unused production facilities.

IS IT A GOOD POLICY TO PROPOSE A REDUCTION IN TAXES WHEN THE BUDGET IS ALREADY IN DEFICIT?

As I have previously said, our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget. Rather our choice is between chronic deficits resulting from chronic slack in the economy, on the one hand, and tran-

sitional deficits temporarily enlarged by tax revision designed to promote full employment, thus increasing revenues and making possible an ultimately balanced budget.

CAN WE AFFORD A FURTHER INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT?

Whether measured by the total size of the debt or by annual interest payments, the Federal debt is becoming a progressively lighter burden on the economy:

| Calendar year | Federal debt end of year (billions) | Percent of GNP | Annual interest payments (billions) | Percent of GNP |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1947..... | \$256.9 | 109.6 | \$5.0 | 2.1 |
| 1952..... | 267.4 | 77.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |
| 1957..... | 274.9 | 62.1 | 7.6 | 1.7 |
| 1962..... | 303.5 | 54.8 | 9.6 | 1.7 |

The public debt as a proportion of our gross national product will fall to 53 percent of the gross national product in fiscal 1964, compared to 57 percent when this administration took office. Last year the total increase in the Federal debt was only 2 percent, compared to an 8 percent increase in the gross debt of State and local governments. Taking a longer view, the Federal debt today is only 13 percent higher than it was in 1946, while State and local debt increased over 360 percent and private debt by 300 percent.

MY CONCLUSION

We are a leader in the world. We are a growing nation. We have an unfulfilled destiny. By bold action, clear thinking, and high hopes we will be able to lead in a manner which makes us all proud.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

II Corinthians 4: 8: *We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair.*

Almighty God, may our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative body daily seek to impart from their lofty places of leadership the blessings of encouragement and hope to struggling humanity.

May noble principles and purposes permeate their minds and hearts, constraining them to contribute the best they have of wisdom and energy in loyal and loving service to our country and all mankind.

Grant them the inspiration and courage to believe that the very stars in their courses are fighting for and with them as they strive with might and main to steer the Ship of State, during these perilous times, into deeper and wider channels.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 14, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 112

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of

the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 92. An act for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung);

S. 97. An act for the relief of Purificacion Slat;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Michelina Lanni;

S. 195. An act for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Young Wai;

S. 234. An act for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro;

S. 421. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho;

S. 436. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialogowski;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 574. An act for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Roswitha Selb;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Krystyna Ratay;

S. 688. An act for the relief of Ronald Whiting;

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration;

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof;

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to chapter 5, section 243, Public Law 87-794, has recommended Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to be members of the U.S. delegation for trade negotiations.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-420, has appointed Mr. MCGOVERN to be a member of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, vice Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, resigned.

THE LATE WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce to my colleagues the death last Thursday of William W. Blackney, who represented Michigan's Sixth District in the House during the 74th and the 76th through the 82d Congresses. I know Mr. Blackney has many friends here who served with him during his years of service to our Nation who will be saddened by this news.

My first recollection of Congressman Blackney, or "Uncle Bill," as I have affectionately called him, was during my college days when I visited his congressional office. I have always felt indebted to Mr. Blackney for his warm welcome, and his instilling in me a deep interest in the legislative affairs of our country.

I have valued his friendship through the years. Since I have been a Member of Congress, Mr. Blackney has offered me his assistance on numerous occasions and frequently accompanied me about our district which he knew so well. I have always appreciated his sage advice and looked forward to seeing him whenever I visited Flint.

Mr. Blackney was born in Clio, Mich., which is part of the district he represented for 16 years. He moved to Flint when a young man in 1905 and began his public service as Genesee County clerk. After his graduation from the law school at the University of Michigan and his admission to the bar in 1912, he commenced law practice in Flint and the very next year served as assistant prosecuting attorney for the county. He was a member of the Flint School Board for 10