

ment and their dependents under 5 U.S.C. 103a.

Section 11 requires the President to transmit reports to Congress on operations under the bill at least once in each fiscal year.

Section 12 provides that all persons employed or assigned to duties and all corpsmen enrolled under the bill shall be investigated to insure that the employment, assignment, or enrollment is consistent with the national interest in accordance with standards and procedures established by the President. It is anticipated that under this provision the same type of investigations would be provided for National Service Corps personnel and corpsmen as are presently provided for Federal employees.

Section 13 authorizes the President to adopt a seal or emblem for the National Service Corps.

Section 14 is the same as section 20 of the Peace Corps Act. It amends the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to suspend principal and interest payments on such loans for student borrowers during the period of their National Service Corps service, as is now provided with respect to borrowers in military service. Because of possible constitutional objections to this amendment if applied mandatorily to loans outstanding on the date of enactment of the bill, a proviso has been added which would apply the amendments to loans outstanding on that date only with the consent of the lender.

Section 15 is the same as section 21 of the Peace Corps Act. It contains a technical amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act to assure that a corpsman who later became a participant in

the civil service retirement system would not receive both annuity payments under that system and social security benefits based upon his period of volunteer service.

Section 16 defines various terms used in the bill. In particular, subsection (d) defines the period of service of a corpsman so as to include the training period prior to enrollment, except for the purpose of accruing retirement or other credit in connection with subsequent Federal employment. These definitions are substantially the same as those in section 25 of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 17 is a standard separability provision.

Section 18 provides that the bill's effective date shall be the date of its enactment.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1963

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

Rev. George Claude Baker, Jr., of Perkins School of Theology, Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Be pleased, O God, to accept the gratitude of our hearts for the renewed gifts of Thy mercy. Thou hast granted us the light of another day and strength for our tasks. Thou hast linked our lives with solemn responsibilities through which we may serve our fellow men and Thee. Grant us, O Lord, righteous motives for all we do. Guard us from selfish decisions, and guide us into wise choices.

Amid the debate of policies and the discussions of plans, so direct and bless the President, the Vice President, and all in authority, especially this body of Senators, that they may fashion a bold vision of Thy divine purposes for our Nation and for all lands, wherein earth shall be fair, men shall be free, justice shall obtain, and peace shall bless.

So may our destiny be shaped by Thee, Almighty God, that all men may know Thy law, walk in Thy ways, and make known Thy love, through the power of Thy Holy Spirit. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 2, 1963, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 11, 1963,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, on May 3, 1963, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the

President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 168) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT BY OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended March 31, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi Offshore Warning Area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CHIEF M. SGT. SAMUEL W. SMITH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 753(b), TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGES IN FUNCTIONS OF THE BEACH EROSION BOARD AND THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A certified engrossed copy of a legislative bill (No. 449) enacted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENGROSSED LEGISLATIVE BILL 449"

"A bill for an act to ratify a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the poll tax or other tax as a qualification for voting

"Be it enacted by the people of the State of Nebraska,

"SECTION 1. That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, set forth in the resolution appearing in section 2 of this act, is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

"Sec. 2. That the resolution mentioned in section 1 of this act was referred to this legislature for action thereon by the Governor of Nebraska, and reads as follows:

"POLL TAX AS A QUALIFICATION FOR VOTING

"Senate Joint Resolution 29

"Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

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

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

"Sec. 3. That copies of this act be duly certified by the Secretary of State and forwarded by the Governor to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"DWIGHT W. BURNETT,
"President of the Legislature.

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

"Approved April 8, 1963.

"FRANK B. MORRISON,
"Governor."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to qualifications of electors

"Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America by a constitutional majority thereof made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

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

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

"Resolved and enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

"SECTION 1. RATIFICATION. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America as set forth herein be and the same is hereby ratified and consented to by the State of Iowa and by the General Assembly thereof.

"SEC. 2. CERTIFICATION. That the certified copies of this enactment and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"W. L. MOOTY,
"President of the Senate.

"ROBERT W. NADEN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"CARROLL A. LANE,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved April 29, 1963.

"HAROLD E. HUGHES,
"Governor."

A telegram from the City Council of Gingoog City, the Philippines, signed by its secretary, remonstrating against an amendment of the war damage bill giving the money to the Philippine Government instead of the claimants; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1451. A bill to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1452. A bill to donate to the Stockbridge-Munsee community some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1453. A bill authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PROUTY (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1455. A bill for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. RIMCOFF, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. PELL):

S. 1456. A bill to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from Hartford, Conn., to Providence, R.I.; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1457. A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative

Services Act of 1949 to facilitate the procurement of certain surplus personal property by State agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ALIEN PROPERTY UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, in the last session of the 87th Congress both House and Senate passed bills dealing with some aspects of our alien property problem under the Trading With the Enemy Act. Since there were divergent views on some matters contained in these bills a final conference between House and Senate took place on the last day of the 87th Congress in 1962. As a result of the conference a garbled language on one item developed which had failed to take into account a dictum in a U.S. Supreme Court decision on June 25, 1962, in the so-called Glidden case, which related to the general jurisdiction of the Court of Claims.

The Senate version of the bill was in compliance with the court decision but the conference language was something of a mixture which overlooked it. One of the results of the Glidden decision was to place about 35 cases referred to the Court of Claims by action of only one branch of Congress, in a state of suspension, and some effort has already been made to draft general legislation so that all doubts concerning congressional intent in the 35 cases referred to would be resolved.

At the moment general legislation on this subject does not seem practicable and in addition, the case involved in the Senate bill is such that it merits separate treatment. One reason for this view is that in the case referred to it was the only one considered by both branches of the Congress and was, therefore, incorporated in a bill which was signed by the President. The garbled language does, in fact, defeat the real intent of both Houses of the Congress and that intent was to give the U.S. stockholders of the General Dyestuff Corp. a trial in the Court of Claims on the basic merit of the respective claims. The measure I am introducing, therefore, undertakes to restore the Senate language and should, therefore, be approved by both the Senate and the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1451) to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETURN OF CERTAIN LANDS TO STOCKBRIDGE-MUNSEE INDIAN COMMUNITY, SHAWANO COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill which provided for the return to the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian community, in Shawano County, Wis., of lands adjacent to their

reservation which were taken over by the Federal Government in the 1930's. Unfortunately, that bill was not acted on last year.

I am introducing the bill again, this year; and my bill is being cosponsored by my distinguished junior colleague [Mr. NELSON].

The lands involved are considered submarginal. They were taken over by the Federal Government during the depression, under the national industrial recovery program and the Farm Security Administration.

For many years, the Department of Agriculture had jurisdiction over the lands. Recently, they were turned over to the Department of the Interior, to be administered for the benefit of the Stockbridge-Munsee community.

But many members of the tribe who live on the lands can get title only on a year-to-year basis. This uncertain tenure makes it very difficult to establish decent homes and farms, and to secure satisfactory mortgage financing.

The bill would promote this by donating the land to the tribe, and making it part of the reservation. Such action has been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in both the Kennedy administration and the Eisenhower administration. This means that the bill has bipartisan support.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill, and request its appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 1452) to donate to the Stockbridge-Munsee community some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR STUDY OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BY THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

This bill provides an authorization of \$50,000 for the operations of a joint select committee, composed of Members of both the Senate and the House, whose duty shall be to prepare a statement of conclusions, together with their reasons therefor, suggesting a proper form of local self-government for the District of Columbia.

The bill requires that the report of the committee must be submitted to the Congress not later than January 1 of 1964.

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

The bill (S. 1453) authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr.

PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DEDUCTION TO TAXPAYERS WHO ARE COLLEGE STUDENTS WORKING ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY PART OF THEIR WAY THROUGH COLLEGE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to aid students who are working all or a substantial part of their way through college.

These students have demonstrated their great desire to obtain more education and their willingness to labor for it.

How difficult it is for these thousands of youngsters who are trying to prepare for tough courses and at the same time must hold down a job to pay their tuition expenses.

A National Science Foundation study points out that a lack of money caused up to one-half of the male college dropouts, and one-third of the female dropouts quit college because they simply did not have adequate financial resources.

Members of Congress seem to recognize that education is important and we permit philanthropists and others tax deductions if they make charitable donations to educational institutions.

Yet when a poor boy or girl works full time during the summer and part time during the school year to pay for his or her books or tuition, the Federal Government taxes their meager income without regard to the fact that it is being used for education.

How inconsistent this is to allow a deduction to the rich man when he does something for education and to deny similar benefits to hard-pressed young men and women who are willing to work night and day to learn—to get ahead—to become better citizens.

One of the great questions facing this Nation is whether higher education should be limited to those who can afford it.

Many of the keenest students in the Nation come from the poorest families and it is said that one-third of these talented and needy youngsters are financially unable to attend college.

We shall need a million and one-half engineers and over half a million scientists by 1970.

To meet this need we should graduate about 80,000 engineers a year during the 1960's. Sad to say, however, current enrollments indicate that we will be graduating fewer than 40,000 per year through at least 1964.

Sure, scholarships are some help but studies show that the average scholarship award—whether from a corporation or a State program—is approximately \$400 per year—less than one-quarter of the cost of attending college.

Loans are becoming more available, but the student who may have to help out at home after he graduates from college is not always eager to accept the prospect of total borrowing. He would much rather work as much as possible while he goes to college so that he will

not be faced with huge obligations when he finishes his training.

Many Americans in the past have worked all or at least a part of their way through college and they have a right to be proud of it.

But times have changed. The cost of going to college was less then and taxes did not get into the picture.

Today educational costs are much higher and a student who works for his education does get into the tax picture and incurs a penalty, an extra charge for education, from the U.S. Government.

This very unfair situation exists notwithstanding the fact that we are more aware than we ever have been of the benefits of education to our national well-being and even more survival.

Let us reorient our thinking and be grateful that we have thousands of young boys and girls who have caught the spirit of our free society. Let us not dampen that spirit by taxing in a cold routine manner the nickels and dimes they have earned to pay their tuition and book expenses.

My bill does not give a complete tax-exempt status to students who work while they attend college, but it does allow them to deduct for tax purposes certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education.

The deduction allowed is this: up to \$1,200 per taxable year for an undergraduate student and up to \$1,500 per taxable year for a graduate student. The work must be toward a baccalaureate or graduate degree. The deduction is only for tuition, fees, and supplies. It does not apply to sustaining expenses of board and room.

The student may be going to school either full or part time, but he or she must be in a degree program from an institution which is accredited either nationally or regionally. Hobby courses, beauty culture or any program in any institution would not be accepted as legitimate degree work and will not be aided.

By putting a ceiling on deductions, an undue burden upon the tax structure is eliminated. This ceiling has been set carefully in terms of average costs in a private school as figured by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A lower ceiling would discriminate against private institutions. A higher one would benefit unfairly the higher cost private schools and be a stimulus to them to raise fees.

A principal aim, of course, is to help the student taxpayer, and this it will. For example, if a student earned \$2,000 in 1 year, took full advantage of the \$1,200 deduction, plus his personal exemption and automatic 10 percent deduction, he would pay no tax at all.

Certain exemptions and special deductions are available under our tax laws because it is said that they serve national purposes which are more important than the mere raising of revenue.

What expenditure of money will bring greater returns for the public benefit than the expenditure of funds for education?

What greater purpose can a tax deduction serve than to stimulate an intelligent young boy or girl to prepare

for teaching or science or engineering where they can make a lifetime contribution to their Nation?

I pay tribute to the hundreds of thousands of young men and women who are working their way through college, and I express the sincere hope that we will be able to tell them before this year is out that Congress recognizes their efforts and that help is on the way.

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

The bill (S. 1454) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCLUSION OF ROUTE NO. 6 FROM HARTFORD TO PROVIDENCE INTO THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators RIBICOFF, PASTORE, and PELL, a bill which would include an additional 75 miles between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., in the National System of Interstate and Defense highways.

A recent analysis undertaken by the Connecticut and Rhode Island Highway Departments indicates a serious need for a supplemental interstate highway in this area.

My colleagues and I are of the opinion that this addition to the Interstate System meets all the necessary criteria and would serve peacetime, wartime, and national defense interests.

The proposed route would be in a direct easterly direction from Hartford and would roughly follow the present U.S. Route No. 6.

The joint study done by the Connecticut and Rhode Island Highway Departments proves conclusively that the 12 standards of criteria for the selection of routes for interstate highways are completely met by the selection of this route.

Not only would the proposed route serve the maximum number of urban population centers in the area but it would also serve the needs of the rural population as well. Its location would take into consideration the requirements of manufacturing communities and also be of value to agriculture markets along its route.

The proposed route further meets the standards of serving Military and Naval Establishments as well as defense industries.

My colleagues and I feel there is much justification for including this additional 75 miles of highway in the Interstate System and we hope that early action will be possible to make this a reality.

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

The bill (S. 1456) to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from Hartford, Conn., to Providence, R.I.,

introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor of S. 835, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930. We welcome Senator MCINTYRE's support for this bill and are pleased to have him as a cosponsor.

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

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 301 OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on February 28 I, along with a number of other Senators introduced the bill (S. 941) which would amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] desires to cosponsor this proposal and I ask unanimous consent that his name be added at this time.

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

DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 9 IN EACH YEAR AS LEIF ERIKSON DAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 1, 1963, the name of Mr. JACKSON was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 76) to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on May 1, 1963.

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. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Disarmament: The Grand Delusion," published in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on May 2, 1963; and his newsletter of May 6, 1963, entitled "Disarmament: Wishful Thinking."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of May 5 appears an article, by the able and highly knowledgeable Capitol correspondent, Robert C. Albright, which deals with the brilliant majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. Albright, by the adept use of highlights and sidelights from the Senator's career, presents a very vivid profile of our distinguished colleague, who is noted for his honesty, his integrity, his know-how, his understanding, and his tolerance. As a Senator, HUBERT HUMPHREY

is an outstanding example of the value of full debate in the Senate in clarifying the issues which confront us and in the creation and evolution of remedies for meeting these issues. As a leader in this body and in the Democratic Party, he personifies the dedication to public responsibility and the courageous approach to innovation which for so many years have kept Democrats closely attuned to the needs of the American people.

Mr. Albright, in his unique and exceptional fashion, has given the public a revealing glimpse of one of the most able of Senators. I am delighted to call his article to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PERPETUAL MOTION HUMPHREY HAS SOARED IN 15 YEARS

(By Robert C. Albright)

The U.S. Senate has many wonders, but only one challenge to natural law: For going on 15 years now, one of its Members has been in perpetual motion.

The bundle of energy is Minnesota's HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, compulsive talker, walker, idea catalyst and wit. He can spout more words, put in more bills, whirl in and out of more meetings, race over more territory than any other politician in memory. He's all over the Senate's legislative spectrum.

Dazzled colleagues can't explain how he keeps up the pace. Contrary to legend, this sort of vitality doesn't come out of those vitamin bottles he always keeps handy around the office. HUMPHREY generates activity. When forced to lay off, he frets, witts, and turns physically pale.

At 52, a comparative youth by Senate standards, he has mellowed slightly from the brash young Democrat of 39 who first came to the Chamber from Minnesota in January 1949. To the Senate, he has become a fact of political life. But the galleries rediscover him daily and reporters monitor him as they would a man in orbit.

He's been called everything from a windbag to a paragon of oratorical brilliance; from a meddler to a goal-scoring team player—depending on who's talking. The truth, as always, lies in between.

But however one rates him otherwise, he's a bright daub of color across the Senate's sepia landscape.

In two decades, he has clambered from defeated candidate for mayor of Minneapolis to No. 2 Democrat in the Senate. A fellow Senator he once tried to lick in the presidential primaries, John F. Kennedy, now sits in the White House but listens to his advice.

In a way, HUMPHREY has become a sort of idea factory for Kennedy administration bills. The Peace Corps, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Senate-phased youth opportunities and wilderness bills had their inception in Humphrey proposals.

The Chamber that once gawked at his flaming liberalism, and smiled at his boundless enthusiasm, long ago took him into its inner club. The liberalism is still there, tempered by experience, but even the southerners have learned to live with him.

Critics say he tries to do too much, puts in too many bills, fails to set priorities and ration his time. He has all the traits of the man in a hurry. Sometimes he even catches up with his appointments, but seldom on time.

Newsmen, the most critical of audiences, have grown used to cooling their heels while waiting for his scheduled press conferences. When he shows up, it's worth it. But often

the time runs out and the conference is canceled.

HUMPHREY has been known to attend, even speak at, three or four luncheons in one day, but he generally returns to his office hungry and unfed. When he finds time, he drops by the Senate cafeteria for a sandwich and some soup.

He is likely to react to the challenge of the moment and respond to the stimulus of an immediate set of circumstances rather than plan ahead carefully. In many long-range fields, however, he has shown phenomenal perseverance.

He has been President Kennedy's strong right arm on disarmament policy. Under General Eisenhower as well as under Mr. Kennedy, in fact, he stoutly maintained that an effective nuclear test-ban treaty was in the national interest of the United States.

Among HUMPHREY's surprising number of legislative firsts was S. 3675, calling for establishment of a Peace Corps. He introduced it in the Senate June 15, 1960. Many others had supported the idea and called for a study, but HUMPHREY got there first with a bill. In 1961, HUMPHREY helped push Mr. Kennedy's own Peace Corps bill to enactment.

Two years before, during the Eisenhower administration, the Senate passed a Humphrey youth employment bill. It foundered in the House. This year, HUMPHREY urged the President to give the Kennedy youth bill No. 1 priority. During the pre-Easter rush, the Senate passed it, with Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, joining HUMPHREY in applying the spurs.

HUMPHREY was among the first to push the food for peace idea, and as long ago as 1960 he proposed an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Eight years ago he scored another first, offering the original bill to preserve millions of acres of America's wilderness. The Senate recently passed it, for the second straight year.

Sometimes HUMPHREY improvises with the ideas of others to frame legislation aimed at pressing needs. Just now there's a gleam in his eye reflecting his concern for the problems of megalopolis and our overpopulated seaboard areas. Any day now there'll probably be a Humphrey bill on how best to assure for future generations adequate open space and recreational facilities.

During the 1960 presidential year, four full-fledged Democratic presidential candidates blossomed in the Senate. But it was HUMPHREY who directly challenged Mr. Kennedy in decisive primaries all the way from Wisconsin to HUMPHREY's West Virginia "Waterloo."

Few would have bet money on HUMPHREY's political future when Mr. Kennedy became the Nation's 34th President. But Mr. Kennedy welcomed HUMPHREY into the leadership fold. Today, there are few legislators closer to the White House.

In the Senate, his stature has grown as second in command to Democratic Leader MANSFIELD and heir apparent to the office if the Senate follows its recent tradition of promoting the majority whip.

Time was when the Senate's southern Democrats would not have stood still for any leadership role for the man who came to the Senate in the wake of the bruising civil rights fight he led on the 1948 Democratic convention floor. Barely had he taken his oath before he tangled with a leading southerner, Virginia's HARRY FLOOD BYRD. The Senate, which stands by its seniors, administered a merciless hazing.

But today HUMPHREY gets along reasonably well with the Dixie contingent. The fact is that he likes most of the southern Members and they respect him. They fall out during every civil rights ruckus, then make friends again.

HUMPHREY's own basic liberalism is not subject to challenge, but occasionally he is needed by some of the progressives for not

playing a more militant role. In one instance, he was asked to join a picket line at the White House in support of a liberal cause. Said HUMPHREY:

"Why do that, when I can go in and have breakfast with the President?"

Today's Senate is not noted for its orators. The last golden-voiced speaker passed on with the retirement of the late Senator Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia. With a few notable exceptions, modern Senators speak their piece without rising to frenzied heights, then call it a day.

HUMPHREY is one of the exceptions. On a moment's notice, he can delight the Senate with a sparkling flood of words and humor. Seldom if ever is there any prepared text. The day before his appearance as a featured Gridiron dinner speaker, aides were startled to learn that he had prepared nothing in advance. A text was rushed out on the eve of the dinner.

Whether on the stump or in the Senate, HUMPHREY has only one problem: How to turn off the torrent of talk. For the first 20 minutes, he's a charmer. Then the audience grows restless. For HUMPHREY doesn't know when to stop.

Recently he worked out a compromise. By sheer willpower he holds speeches short during the business start of the Senate's day. Then he compensates by delivering those long, long speeches after most of his colleagues have gone home.

One way or another, to an audience or without one, he has to talk.

LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the press, this morning, carries reports that Prince Souvanna Phouma may withdraw as Prime Minister of Laos. These reports, Mr. President, are most disturbing. From the outset, he has been the one man in a position of leadership in Laos who has been fully and courageously dedicated to the concept of a peaceful, neutral, and unified Laos. His withdrawal at this time would spell the end of effective efforts to create, in that nation, conditions which would benefit all concerned and, most of all, the people of Laos. It would spell the end, for all practical purposes, of the attempt to apply the Geneva accords.

Mr. President, the cost of United States aid to Laos has been sharply reduced during the brief period in which Souvanna Phouma has been Prime Minister. If Souvanna Phouma is now compelled to withdraw, if circumstances are such that he feels that further efforts are fruitless, as it would seem to me that this Nation should give immediate consideration to the complete termination of all United States aid to Laos, pending a complete reexamination of our entire problem there.

So long as Souvanna Phouma remains, there is hope that a solution can be achieved which will salvage something worthwhile for peace and freedom in return for the approximately \$500 million which, in a decade, we have poured into that remote land. If he goes, there is little prospect of anything but a prolonged blood bath, induced by rival war lords, supported by outside powers, which will devastate the remote and rustic villages and decimate the peaceful inhabitants of that unfortunate kingdom. It is doubtful, in my opinion, that it is in any way in the U.S. interest to subsidize any part of that revolting process.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether I correctly interpret his statement on Laos to mean that if the efforts of Souvanna Phouma are not successful, and if he is forced to withdraw as Prime Minister, all our aid to Laos should stop immediately; or that our aid should continue until we re-examine our Laos policy after which our aid to that country might be stopped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me repeat my statement: "If Souvanna Phouma is now compelled to withdraw, if circumstances are such that he feels that further efforts are fruitless, it would seem to me that this Nation should give immediate consideration to the complete termination of all U.S. aid to Laos, pending a complete reexamination of our entire position there."

That decision is not—of course, will not be—the decision of the Senator from Montana. It is the decision of the President of the United States which must prevail. He would have at his fingertips all the available information as to what the situation was there, and he would have to make the decision. But in view of the situation which has developed in that unhappy kingdom, I believe that the times may call for drastic action of the sort proposed. Souvanna Phouma, in my opinion, is the one man who can keep Laos together and bring about the creation of a buffer state, a neutral state, and a unified state.

We ought to keep that in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Montana. I have been in Laos. The only question I raised about the Senator's statement is that if we should shut off all aid immediately, there would certainly be great turmoil. On the other hand, I agree with the Senator that current events are fast bringing this matter to a conclusion unless the present government can be continued under the Geneva accord. If the Geneva agreement breaks down, our aid policy certainly should be reexamined, and we should come to some definite conclusion regarding our entire Laos policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted at the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I am glad to note that he is in accord with the suggestion—and it is only a suggestion—which I have made. I would point out that, once before, Souvanna Phouma was forced from the premiership, and on that occasion, following his withdrawal, the situation in Laos became worse and our aid was expanded enormously.

I should like to point out also that Souvanna Phouma is the one man in the present situation upon whom it seems possible to depend to bring about the type of agreement which was envisaged in the Geneva accord. This agreement was at best tenuous, a calculated risk. But I also point out that what happens in Laos, in view of its location, is very important in relation to the rest of southeast Asia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is very true. If Laos goes, the whole situation over there will be very much changed. We must make sure that Laos does not

go if we can possible prevent it, but certainly our aid should not be continued there indefinitely. We are really supporting the entire Government of Laos today, or at least 75 percent of it. If our aid were suddenly withdrawn, there would be no chance for a stable government in Laos in my opinion.

MR. MANSFIELD. If Souvanna Phouma were to withdraw, the situation of Laos would become very much more difficult and would cause us to reexamine our whole policy because of the dangers which would come about because of such an action. If he were to withdraw, the dangerous situation in southeast Asia would become doubly dangerous as a result.

MR. SALTONSTALL. There is no question about that.

NATIONS OF THE PACIFIC—ARTICLES BY ROY A. ROBERTS

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President during the month of April, the Kansas City Star published a series of articles by the distinguished chairman of the board of this outstanding newspaper, Mr. Roy A. Roberts. Mr. Roberts toured the rim of the Western Pacific and the countries and islands of the South Pacific. He wrote vividly of his impressions, garnered, with a reporter's eye and ear, from New Zealand to Tokyo.

As I have noted on previous occasions, this is a region of the world of which our knowledge and understanding are only too sparse and limited. That is particularly the case with respect to the two great nations "down under" with whom we are allied—New Zealand and Australia. Mr. Roberts has performed a public service in reporting on his visits to those countries and to the other regions of the Far East. Let me say, too, that in his penetrating article on the new State of Hawaii he has illuminated not only the great addition which its admission to the Union has made, but also its high importance to the future of the United States in the Pacific.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of excellent articles by Mr. Roy Roberts 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 Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 12, 1963]

PEACE DAGGER BY RED CHINA—MAO'S FORCES HOLD MORE PERIL THAN RUSSIA, ROY ROBERTS REPORTS—LEADERSHIP AT STAKE—EDGE OVER SOVIETS SEEN IN DEEP-ROOTED ASIA-FOR-ASIANS BOND

(NOTE.—Since early this year, Roy A. Roberts has been traveling in the Far East. This is the first of several articles written upon his return.)

Back home after a fascinating, nearly 3-month tour of the South Pacific and Orient, I find several impressions—just that, no more—stand out in my mind.

Communist Red China presents a far more dangerous threat to world peace and our own future security than Russia. Of that I am completely convinced.

Seeing, firsthand, the population explosion in the Orient—you saw it, felt it and it bore in on you in country after country—I brought home the feeling that this pressure

of people is almost as dangerous as the nuclear threat itself. History tells us nothing has created more wars than this pressure of populations for survival.

The split between Mao, the Red Chinese boss, and Khrushchev, the Russian dictator, is far more serious and deep-rooted, and could have more far-reaching consequences, than we have recognized so far over here.

A TIME OF STRESS

But don't be too sanguine about it. Conceivably, in the long pull, it could work out to the advantage of the free world. On the other hand, as the two rival camps of communism pull and tug in a power struggle, it could make more difficult our immediate job of finding a way to live in the same world with Russia and Red China. And for the present, this latter result is more probable.

Of all the trouble and danger spots—and they're everywhere—in that vast, unfathomable Far East that we so little understand, Indonesia seemed to me, on a hunch, to be nearest the exploding point. This could create a situation even more dangerous than the tough, indecisive battle we now are waging to hold Vietnam, in southeast Asia, out from under Red domination.

I could go on and list many more impositions here, such as the fabulous story of Japan's comeback, but these are the vital ones concerning world peace which I picked up on an altogether-too-hasty survey.

A VACATION TRIP

I don't pretend to be any expert on the Far East; a vacation trip on a luxury ship is not a very good premise for any survey, and we left the ship frequently to fly, in order to cover more ground. Such a trip, in itself, would be no better background than that of someone who spends a few days in New York and Washington and then poses as an expert on America.

What I did do during the trip, however, was to meet newspapermen at every major port and pick their minds on how they saw conditions in the Far East. Most of them had been out there for years—this is certainly no field for the novice reporter. What follows, then, outside of certain personal reactions—such as the feeling of the sheer pressure of people, people, people—represents my sizeup of many views, some agreeing and some sharply in conflict, of those who are living through these thrilling days of an emerging Orient on the march.

OPINION OF THOSE THERE

I purposely did not seek out people in government, because I wanted to get more objective viewpoints, but I did occasionally run into some very well-informed people in both government and business. This report is based more on what the men on the job out there feel about the Far East.

Red China, of course, is the real enigma of that part of the world and, I might add, increasingly is becoming more of a factor in the future than is Russia. That despite the very serious, even critical, times they are having behind their Bamboo Curtain. You sense the danger specifically in every port and capital from Singapore to Tokyo.

Make no mistake about it, the Chinese brand of communism is a far greater threat to world peace than the Russian version, and there's certainly no reason to be lulled into security by the latter, either. They just operate differently. Always, and particularly in the Far East, you have to view everything in the perspective of history, because time is endless in the Orient. It might be added, so is their patience. They're not in a hurry as we are.

You sense, too, that in Russia, as history has always shown to be the case, the fires of revolution are beginning to burn out. They have begun to acquire some of the things that make life better. They have built up

a giant industrial complex, have projected themselves into a world power and now they have learned enough to realize that nuclear war would mean total destruction. Hence, basically, they now seek to communize the world, as always, but short of total war.

In Red China, on the other hand, they don't have much to lose. A war of nuclear devastation, with their hundreds of millions of people, might possibly leave them in a relatively improved position with fewer mouths to feed. Thus their tough, uncompromising position in world affairs.

Let it be said, no one is fooled by Mr. K—he is no angel but he has shown that he doesn't want total war. The pressures of the struggle with China for leadership of the Communist world, however, in some respects make it more difficult for him to work out any kind of accommodation with the West.

A BUFFER STATE

Again, let's lug in what history has told us for hundreds of years, that Russia has always been more or less a buffer state between the East and West. Moscow, of course, vociferously denies and scorns any suggestion that a complete breach might occur between them and Peiping, with Russia turning toward the West. Nevertheless, unless somebody touches that fatal nuclear button in the next few years, it's a fairly good guess that, as the Russian internal economy improves, they will again find themselves back in their historic role as the East-West buffer state. That's just a thought—not a prophecy.

At Hong Kong, especially, naturally asked everyone—newspapermen, educators and whomever—how really serious was this break between Moscow and Peiping? I was surprised at the unanimity with which they all took it seriously. I had expected to hear of some public, kiss-and-make-up type of meeting for the sake of giving the world a picture of Communist unity.

THE RIFT DEEPENS

Instead I found that most observers felt the split had only emphasized basic cleavages between Russia and China, and that as the years progress these will deepen and widen rather than heal.

One night in Hong Kong, sitting in a restaurant with a small group of Chinese and a delightful American couple who have dedicated much of their lives to China, I got this very succinct description of the situation from a very intelligent Chinese:

There are three angles, he explained.

First, the struggle between Khrushchev and Mao for personal leadership of world communism. Much of that is a matter of personalities, but it goes deeper, to the basic question of which way the leadership will go.

Secondly, there is a strong nationalistic clash between the two countries, along their borders and over the issue of which will dominate their satellite and neighboring countries. These differences will endure no matter what the next few years develop.

And thirdly, there is the ideological issue as to how Marxism and communism should be interpreted and applied. This is the one over which they quarrel publicly, but the first two factors are more important, and in the order listed.

That was about as clear a picture of the situation as I encountered, and as I tried it out on others there was general assent. Yet everywhere I was cautioned, "Don't expect too much." There is just as much chance that the split will make the free world situation more difficult instead of less so.

Another man who has lived for many years in Hong Kong told me:

"At first I thought it was a phony quarrel, just a bit of minor maneuvering, and I wasn't sure but what it was being done for deceptive purposes. Yet just when I expected it would be patched up with some sort of love feast, out of nowhere came the most bitter exchanges yet between Khrush-

shchev and Mao, almost beyond the point of return.

A REAL DIVISION

"The longer I live out here, the less certain I am of anything they'll do. Despite any public making-up that may occur, the basic clash between two schools of communism as to which will continue to exist certainly has been dramatized. And we should never forget it."

At Singapore and all other stops, I heard varying opinions as to whether the other Communist or near-Communist nations of Asia would side with Peiping or Moscow in case of a showdown; countries, that is, such as Burma, Indonesia, and Mongolia. Except for North Korea and North Vietnam, most of them still give some public lip-service to Russia, because Russia can give them things they need.

I found, however, that most of those who have lived longest in the Orient believe that if those nations had to make a choice—and they don't want to—they probably would side with Peiping, for two reasons:

First, they're Asiatic, and Mao's revolution is more than just Communist. Underlying it is a philosophy of Asia for the Asians. It was even more a peasant uprising than was that in Russia.

USING RUSSIA'S PLOY

In the second place, there is a strange paradox. For years, in her efforts at international subversion and infiltration, Russia has used the technique of representing the have-nots against the haves in the Western bloc nations. In the Orient, now, China is using the same technique in her power struggle with Moscow, only Russia represents the haves and China the have-not countries. And it's just as effective as what the West has had to contend with.

All this points up the fact that when we believe we can make a deal with Russia on the Far East, it may be just a part of her devious strategy of deception. Russia may not be able to deliver any more, as she used to, now that China is prepared to ignore any Moscow decisions as not binding on her at all.

The very least China would accept, apparently, is equal partnership in communism with complete domination of Asia. But with the huge populations of the Orient which would fall into the Chinese orbit under such an arrangement, Khrushchev probably is no more anxious to see this happen than he would be to see China become a nuclear power.

Up to now, his ace in the hole in asserting world Communist leadership is that Russia is a nuclear power but little else.

A SHIFTING LEADERSHIP

Where is it all going to end? I can't pretend to have brought home any specific answer, but I would point out one highly significant factor for the future: Not only in the Far East but in Europe as well there is a period of waiting and drifting now for one vital reason—the world leaders there are growing old. Mac is aging; Chiang Kai-shek, on Formosa, is nearing the end of his string. Khrushchev himself is no youngster and is showing the strain. In West Germany, Adenauer will step down next fall, and in France, De Gaulle has reached the age where more and more people are asking, "What next? And who next?" Elections are in the offing in Britain with some new faces likely to come on the scene.

Of course, no one can predict, but I would suggest that barring the usual passing crises—and they'll always be with us in both the East and West—not until the old leaders pass on will it become clear how world trends and currents are going to run in the years ahead. I came home from the Far East with the feeling that this is how it will be out there, too.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 14, 1963]

CAN HOLD OFF CHINA DECISION—BUT EVENTUALLY THE UNITED STATES MUST DEAL WITH RED GIANT—NO RECOGNITION NOW—MOST OBSERVERS BELIEVE THERE WOULD BE NOTHING TO GAIN AT PRESENT

(By Roy A. Roberts)

When you're there, you find yourself caught up in the spirit of the Orient where time means little or nothing and history means much.

You come away from an entirely too brief look-see at the problems of the Bamboo Curtain and the massive Communist revolution behind it—but you come away without a feeling of red-hot urgency.

What's happening there is something that will be going on for a long time to come. So the threat to world peace and to our own security is not for now, but in the long years ahead. How many years is anybody's guess.

STILL FAR BEHIND

Today, the mighty giant of China with its 700 or 800 million people—even they don't know how many—is not industrialized. The Chinese are about where the Russians were three or four decades ago. The Chinese have a long way to go.

But all you have to do is take a look at Japan to see what the Oriental mind can do when given the opportunity. In the span of a few years Japan has become one of the industrial powers, not only of the Orient, but of the entire world.

True, the Japanese had several decades of industrial development, but look how fast they moved, given the time, money, and know-how. There is no reason in the world why the awakening giant of China, with its enormous population, can't do as well. The Chinese already have shown their ability to be the traders and bankers of the East.

ONLY A GUESS

It took Russia 40 years to do the job. How long will it take China? It's anybody's guess. But you can see the probable challenge to the Western world. The great move to industry away from a crude agricultural economy is under way.

Coming away from a brief and entirely too sketchy look at what's going on behind that Bamboo curtain, I find three questions are asked by nearly everyone. I wish I could give definite answers. I didn't find them. But I can suggest some of the possible answers from the thinking I picked up. The questions:

1. When will China become a nuclear power?
2. What are present conditions in China—as best known by constant observers?
3. Should we or should we not recognize the most populous nation in the world and should we continue to oppose its membership in the United Nations?

A GUARDED SECRET

As to that first question, no one knows, and nearly everyone is trying to find out, how far along Chinese scientists are in crashing into the nuclear club. This is a most carefully guarded secret and some say that even the Russians don't know. One thing is dead certain: Khrushchev is no more anxious to see Mao with the bomb than we are.

I asked over and over again the best judgment of those who might read the riddle of the bomb timetable. Some thought Red China might set off its first explosion within the year. But almost without exception they would add, "Don't panic when this happens."

It would be a far cry, they explain, from that explosion to actually putting working missiles on an operational basis. Of course the Chinese can do it and we can't discount the fact. But the industrial capacity

simply isn't there for any quick transformation from an experimental explosion to an atomic arsenal.

A JUNIOR MEMBER

France, for instance, had its first explosion in February 1960. The French still are a long way even from junior membership in the nuclear club. And France is highly industrialized. You might as well make your own guess on Red China, but don't panic. It's coming, even though nobody on the outside knows when.

All this brings up a nagging question. To date, all our negotiations over control have been with Russia although the British more or less have been on the sidelines. But if we are going to have any real global restrictions on nuclear arms, some day Red China will have to be taken into consideration, whether we like it or not. That is one of the paradoxes in the world picture. Nearly everyone agrees that when China gets the bomb, the weapon will be in the hands of one of the most irresponsible powers, a great threat to peace.

If the world is to have enforceable curbs on atomic weapons, some day those curbs will have to apply to China—or they will be worthless.

NEWS LEAKS OUT

Now to the second question on present conditions in China. You get most of the information from across the border. The Communist radio beats waves of information into Hong Kong, Tokyo, and other spots. What they say officially is no secret. It's carefully monitored by many agents. Also, the press of Red China gets out in a steady flow. There is no effort to hold the newspapers in. This information is carefully studied.

Frankly, it seems that the situation is almost the same as in those days along the Russian border after World War I when the Baltic States were the listening posts.

You get a pretty fair and varied picture although the details aren't always adequate or necessarily accurate.

BETTER THAN IN PAST

No one disputes that conditions in Red China, with its huge population, are somewhat better than they were a year ago. That isn't saying too much. An almost unfailing barometer of conditions is the influx of refugees into Hong Kong and the Portuguese crown colonies. When starvation is the only alternative, even the police and the army can't keep down the rush to get out. When the food supply is better, the tide of refugees slows down. But it never stops entirely.

Statistically, I found from government people that, on the average, food production was up 20 percent this year. But that's a rise from an almost impossible starvation level. I doubt whether folks here at home realize how close Red China was to being on the ropes for a year or so. We knew that conditions were bad, but just how bad came out only later.

Some of the trouble was due to droughts, floods, and generally bad weather. But you learn now that much of the difficulty came from the collapse of the Central Government program of completely communizing farm production, and sacrificing everything for industry.

A TURNAROUND

So serious did the food crisis become that the great industrial push had to be stopped. Factories under construction were cut off short. Plants ready to go into production had to stand idle. The Government simply had to get back to food production and the major industrial effort is still suspended. Without wheat purchases from Canada and Australia, the central government might have had a hard time weathering the storm. But it did.

Perhaps it is significant that in various provinces farmers now are allowed to keep small plots and sell the produce. This information came from Chinese who had recently filtered out from behind the curtain. The free enterprise farming, plus better weather, has spurred production.

But many of us probably have missed the really significant event of those dark days of crop failures and starvation. That was the power struggle that set in between Russia and China. Khrushchev withdrew his vitally important technicians and he choked off the flow of aid. No doubt that added great bitterness to the ideological quarrel between the two leaders of the Communist world.

You heard in Hong Kong that Khrushchev was perfectly willing to see the Chinese regime go to pot rather than to face its challenge of leadership in the world and particularly Asia.

MADE THEM PAY

The Russians also made the Chinese pay through the nose for the aid they got. This information comes secondhand, but it is much discussed on the perimeter of Red China.

Summing up this point, you get the picture that conditions could get better, but that already the regime is getting somewhat cocky again. It still isn't strong enough to resume the massive drive toward industrialization.

But in the meantime the Chinese aren't averse to military adventures anywhere that would help politically or fan the spirit of the people. Excursions in India and Vietnam are examples. But they aren't ready yet for anything big.

Most observers say that while the Chinese people may not be happy, the regime is firmly entrenched and won't be upset. As for Chiang's invasion talk, it has propaganda value.

But that's about all it amounts to. Another food collapse could present a different picture. Food production is an internal problem that probably has kept Red China from far greater aggression. We can be absolutely sure that the ruthless program of the Government is to get what it wants, no matter what the cost. It's a different picture from Moscow and the wily Mr. K.

HARD TO ANSWER

Now for the big question. Should we or shouldn't we recognize China—and what about acceptance by the U.N.?

I'll be frank here. I had much more positive views on the subject and thought I knew more about it than before I visited the Orient. I wish I were as positive in my thinking now as I was then. It's one thing to sit at long range. It's another thing altogether to sit on the edge of that teeming, mysterious continent and try to give answers.

Offhand, I found that most of those I talked to gave the opinion that nothing was to be gained at this time by recognition—and that possibly, there was something to lose.

The same people also thought that U.N. membership and diplomatic recognition by the United States are inevitable—sometime. The veteran observers thought that these things would have to come after a gesture by Red China. Advances on our part would involve too much loss of face. After all, we have been their favorite whipping boys—the arch imperialists.

One mistake probably has been the American conception of what is constituted by diplomatic recognition. Certainly it doesn't mean approval. But that is what it seems to the American people. You simply don't condone sin—at least publicly. Yet this is not a realistic approach.

U.N. IS THE FOE

The situation is complicated. For instance, it's not ourselves but the U.N. that is at war with China. Although the true in

Korea has been in effect for years, the problem for the U.N. is to take in a country that fictionally is still at war with the U.N.

China is insisting that we abandon Taiwan (Formosa) and Chiang. Of course that's out of the question. Impossible and dictatorial as Chiang may be at times, we can't forget that several million Chinese followed him into exile. If we abandoned him the greatest blood bath the world has ever seen probably would follow. It would utterly destroy our position in the Far East.

Also, many overlook the sea and air defense line we've drawn to contain communism in the Pacific. It starts in Japan and runs through Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines and ranges down to the two sturdy commonwealth nations, Australia and New Zealand. If we ever abandoned Formosa, the line would be disastrously pierced. Folks at home probably don't realize the extent of the enormous bases we've built up in the Pacific over the years. This is the line of containment far from our own shores.

WAIT AND SEE

So there you have just a few of the problems involved in recognition. When you find veteran and knowledgeable observers wary of such a move, certainly there seems to be no reason to hurry. Nor is any immediate change of policy called for. Maybe we'd better adopt the Chinese policy of letting things rock along for awhile.

On one phase related directly to my own business, I reversed my thinking. I admit to getting up before newspaper meetings in the past and urging that U.S. newsmen be permitted to go to China.

But when you get to the firing line of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Tokyo, you find that most of the news comes from sources outside the curtain. There are the radio monitoring, the publications and the people who have just left China.

This is better than getting news spooned to you on the inside. Sure, we should go when there is freedom to move about, ask questions and get information. But the correspondents in China now seem to be completely halted. They get scooped every day by those on the outside. For the most part, in the Far East, you write what the government wants or you get arrested or kicked out.

ACTION SOMEDAY

But someday, sometime—already we're getting this oriental sense of patience and time—we will have to take China into the family of nations even if it is still Red. We will have to work with them somehow.

It won't be too long until this nation of 800 million is a nation of a billion people. You can't ignore them as if they don't exist, whether you like it or not.

As of today, I doubt whether we could get them to agree on anything—disarmament, trade or whatever. But someday they may recognize that their revolution—partly Communist, even more Asiatic—will have to be adapted to the existence of the rest of the world.

Someday—but when?

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of Apr. 15, 1963]

EAR TO THREAT IN HONG KONG—CROWN COLONY IN ORIENT SERVES AS MAJOR LISTENING POST ON RED CHINA—A CITY OF CONTRASTS—CLEAN AND WELL-GOVERNED, IT IS ALMOST CHOKED WITH REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISM

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Of all the places we visited in the South Pacific and the Orient, if I had to pick one to see again, it unquestionably would be Hong Kong.

Some other spots were more beautiful, Bangkok for example. Compared with Bangkok, with its huge temples, ageless shrines that are roots to the past, Hong Kong in

terms of the Orient is a new and upstart city with little or no tradition.

I wasn't prepared for all we found in Hong Kong—its charming setting, its beautiful harbor, the flood of lights running up the mountainside by night, the myriad of shops and fine business blocks, the really good hotels with their excellent meals, the friendly people—and the pitiable poverty of its refugees.

EAR TO RED CHINA

But above all else Hong Kong today is the No. 1 listening post of the Orient, and that made it doubly fascinating to me. It's the major link between Red China, the most populous nation on earth, and the rest of the world.

The situation of this city is almost incredible. Much has been said of West Berlin as an indefensible island in a sea of communism.

Yet here is this tiny British crown colony, on the very edge of the land mass of Communist China, growing and expanding with the apparent acquiescence of the fiercely nationalistic Reds. From the city, you can drive out to the sealed-off border in less than an hour.

The commies could take over Hong Kong in a matter of hours, and everyone knows it. Yet millions of dollars are being poured into this exposed city and the tide of investment is rising, not dropping.

Obviously, the Reds don't move in because Hong Kong is more useful to them in its present status than it is even to the British and the West. It's their gateway to the Far Pacific and the Western world.

They need it as a trade, banking and shipping outlet. The Communists, loudly belligerent over Formosa and such fly specks as Quemoy and Matsu, nevertheless are content to let the status quo continue, seemingly for an indefinite time, on Hong Kong.

Even Khrushchev, in his recent bitter exchange with Mao over Cuba, twitted them about the contradiction of their position, pointing out they have never made a move on Hong Kong.

SEES A CONTINUANCE

Certainly this situation will continue until Red China opens some other major ports and establishes contact elsewhere with the outside.

In the meantime, hard-headed American businessmen, as well as British, are investing millions of dollars in Hong Kong. Typical is the Hilton chain, which will open a huge new hotel next month in a city where there are many fine hosteries already. Business and banking expansion continues at a feverish pace.

Before the Communist revolution in China, Hong Kong was merely an outpost of British trade, distinguished by its fine harbor and little else. The British have a knack for picking excellent seaports in this part of the world, Singapore on the Malayan peninsula, for example, and Suva in the Fiji islands, a crossroads of the Pacific.

The deep-water harbor of Hong Kong, surrounded by mountains, is a breathtakingly dramatic spectacle for the arriving traveler. It is jammed with literally thousands of vessels, giant Pacific tourist liners, countless freighters from all over the world, a continuous stream of ferry boats crossing from the island to the mainland and Chinese junks and sampans in uncounted thousands. For sheer interest, one could spend several days visiting this waterfront area alone.

In the city itself, public buildings and the banks are located on the island, with most of the main hotels and shops over on the Kowloon peninsula.

Hong Kong doesn't have big department stores, such as those in Tokyo which rival our own, but so many thousands of small shops that one wonders how they all survive. Tailor shops by the hundreds are found all the way from the brand new sea terminal

to small, winding alleys. Jewelry shops offer jade and pearls, others have fine silks and art work.

With the great influx of tourists, tailors, and dressmakers work almost around the clock. You can get a suit made, not in a week or 10 days, but within 48 hours.

It is a shoppers' paradise, built on cheap labor and small margins. Hong Kong merchants even undersold the Japanese on their historic specialty, pearls, to the point where the Japanese had to take off the tax to hold the trade.

A shop with a small store front may have living quarters in the rear, where the family which operates it lives on slim rations, indeed.

A word of advice to American husbands: Don't take your wife to Hong Kong unless you're prepared to loosen your bank roll.

PROBLEM OF REFUGEES

In this colony the British have done their usual competent job. It's clean and well-governed, yet the British cannot cope with the seemingly endless flood of refugees from the interior of China.

The streets of Hong Kong are packed with their teeming masses—an American woman who lives there remarked that she felt safer in the streets than she would in Washington or Chicago.

For me, the people were the most interesting aspect. I like people, period. And I liked the Chinese especially. All through the Orient I found them friendly, intelligent, and appealing.

Of course, I didn't get behind the Bamboo Curtain, where 700 to 800 million of them have been subjected to a continuous brain-washing of hatred for the United States, to see what effect this is having. It certainly has had no effect outside of Red China.

Hong Kong, obviously, has its problems. The one that would disturb me is the constant threat of Red China taking it over, but over there they act as if the present arrangement would go on forever.

The gravest problem is that of absorbing, feeding and finding work for the many tens of thousands of refugees. Crown authorities try to hold them back, but it is like stopping the ocean tides. They slip in through every opening to join their relatives already in Hong Kong.

In this city you see the same story found everywhere in the Orient: The sumptuous quarters above the harbor of the wealthy merchants, bankers, and traders have as neighbors hundreds of squatters' huts built from tin oil cans and other scraps.

The heart aches to see any human being living in such abject poverty; existing, nothing more. It's a situation far beyond the capability of even this efficiently run crown colony.

MAJOR NEWS POST

For me, as a newspaperman, Hong Kong was especially interesting because of the news coverage there. Along with Tokyo and Singapore, it is a major world listening post for news.

The press services—Associated Press and United Press International—the news magazines and broadcasting networks all are making tremendous outlays to keep the world and especially the United States informed of this awakening Orient and its problems.

Out there you find real news veterans who have lived in the Far East for years.

Years ago the British news service, Reuter's, dominated this area, but today the American news services are doing the No. 1 job.

I was very proud of my profession, seeing how they are meeting the challenge of covering this increasingly important world crisis spot. The costs are tremendous and the difficulties many.

In Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Singapore the press enjoys the greatest freedom, but at the outposts, particularly in the new countries,

coverage is almost indescribably difficult. A reporter who writes anything which displeases the government may be jailed or kicked out. The press services are busy constantly trying to get some staff member or some story released.

Most of the services have their headquarters in Tokyo, but now even some individual newspapers maintain correspondents in Hong Kong, from where they can fly to trouble spots—and there is always trouble somewhere.

Having been in this business more than half a century, I would be remiss if I did not comment that the newsgatherers in the Orient by and large are doing a splendidly competent job, probably a better one than we at home are doing in publishing their efforts. News from the Orient, except in times of crisis, seldom rates high in reader esteem.

DRIVE FOR EDUCATION

One other aspect of Hong Kong—and one with a Kansas City angle—rates mention: The great surge for education, more intensive than here at home, as seen in the many colleges and universities.

The Protestant missionaries, driven from Red China and forced to give up their schools there, are continuing their work here.

Among these educators are Dr. Andrew T. Roy and his wife, who is a sister-in-law of Homer C. Wadsworth of the Kansas City Board of Education. The Chung Chi College where Dr. Roy is a department chairman is a fascinating, people-to-people type of operation, training leaders from all over the Orient.

After graduation, when they return to their various countries, they are about as good ambassadors for American friendship as could be developed, and probably more effective than foreign aid.

The story of Hong Kong's problems and significance is almost endless. But its key role is that of a listening post pointing toward Red China from the free world. And it is a most interesting and comfortable spot in which to listen.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 16, 1963]

BIG IMPACT BY SURGING JAPAN—THE VIGOROUS ISLAND NATION MATCHES WEST GERMANY IN ITS COMEBACK—MUST HAVE U.S. TIES—ABSOLUTELY DEPENDENT ON TRADE, NATION LOOKS TO US FOR PROSPERITY

(By Roy A. Roberts)

The miracle story of the Orient is Japan. It's all that and more—make no mistake about it.

I'd never visited this fabulous, jampacked little island of 90 million people that soon will pass 100 million. So I had no background for comparison with the past.

But I had seen the comeback of West Germany—the great rebuilding of the Ruhr after the desolation of war. Now West Germany has one of the world's most potent industrial complexes. That story has been duplicated in Japan on the other side of the globe, perhaps over even greater obstacles. But there is so much similarity in the two comebacks that it strikes you in the face.

VARIETY OF FACTORS

Many factors contributed to the industrial recovery in Germany and Japan. But at the bottom, the basic causes were identical. These were the determination of the people to come back through sheer, hard work without thoughts of hours or wages.

West Germany saw much of its industry smashed in the war and the Russians dismantled a lot of what was left. But the Germans do have tremendous resources in coal, iron, and other raw material. Japan not only suffered comparable destruction, it never has had the natural resources. The Japanese have to ship in the materials, fab-

ricate them and sell them back to the world as finished products.

You don't need statistics to see this tremendous comeback. You see it and feel it from the minute you hit Japan at Kobe. You are aware of it every minute. It's almost unbelievable.

GRIMY TOWNS THERE

Except for the signs, and a bit of difference in the construction of homes, it's not hard to imagine yourself in Pittsburgh, Pa., Gary, Ind., or Youngstown, Ohio, instead of the mysterious East. As you cross Japan on the magnificent electric railway system, most drab, gray and grimy steel towns look like the steel cities of America. You ride through cities of more than a million people.

You've never heard of those cities, but there they are, pouring out smoke and steel and an amazing variety of manufactured products. From one end of the little island to the other you ride past miles of factories and shipyards. Even some of the ancient cities, like Kyoto, are thoroughly industrialized. The holy shrines are almost lost in the gray shadows of the factories.

What we must never forget is that this is an oriental nation making this great leap back to industrial leadership. And while we know that Red China is several decades behind Japan, especially in education, and still basically agricultural, we've got to look into the future. China's population is eight or nine times greater and it has immense natural resources.

You've got to ask yourself: "How soon will China build into a great industrial power as did the Russian Communists?" That's why, for the long pull in the future, the next generation will be worrying about China and the Far East. Europe is still pivotal today. But it seems inescapable that in the future Asia will be the danger.

BETTER PRODUCTS NOW

Don't think that Japan's industry turns out only shoddy, imitative goods. It's true, they do a lot of copying and they aren't always creative in manufacturing. But they turn out a lot of quality goods, too. Against the background of the recent past, the development is fantastic. More than 60 percent of Japanese industry was destroyed in the war and the residential ruin was even greater.

Yet, today, their steel plants are more modern than ours. And along with the dime-store toys, they're turning out items like 100,000-ton tankers.

So far they've been able to compete in most of the world markets. It's the United States that is having the major difficulties. As Japan and Western Europe have come back, our excessive production costs have begun to hurt. This emphasizes that the American people haven't awakened to an overriding fact: We're living in a global economy, not a national one as we used to.

PLACE OF BEAUTY

Somehow, the average newcomer to Japan generally thinks in terms of cherry blossoms, geisha girls, and mystic shrines. They've got those, of course.

The flowers were just beginning to bloom when we took our first look-see at Japan. And Mount Fuji remains one of the most spectacularly beautiful sights in the world. We had real luck on that score. Usually that majestic mountain is shrouded in clouds. We hit it at a time of bright sunshine. It's a rare, moving sight, and I looked at it by the hour from my hotel window at the foot of the mountain.

There are some wonderful hotels in Japan. The Tokyo hotels rival those of New York and so do the big stores. The contrast is great between Hong Kong, a city of small shops, and Tokyo. The big tourist palaces are run efficiently. But for me, the Japanese food couldn't come close to the Chinese with its variety of flavors and ingredients.

For the tourist, there is much beauty from the past to see in Japan. Fujiyama, of course, heads the list, and there are the ancient shrines. But right next to the temples, surprisingly, you find the rubble and debris of industry. And this brings us back to that dominating theme: You just can't ignore the drive, hustle, and bustle of the Japanese people or their will to build a vast industrial nation. You can feel it in the air and you sense a nation in motion.

A STABLE NATION

As a people, the Japanese have never had it so good. There's no question about that. Everybody I talked to said that the Government is stable and wouldn't swing left despite recurrent efforts of the Communists to stir up trouble. As long as the big industrial machine stays in high gear that stability should remain.

Japan is absolutely dependent on world trade and especially trade with the United States of America. It's strictly a matter of survival. Here in the United States, we could survive even a full-fledged depression. But Japan wouldn't survive. For Japan, an American economic debacle would be ruinous.

So you find the leaders of Japan keeping a very close eye on the state of the American economy, the tribulations of the dollar and deficit spending. If we think of these as purely American problems, the Japanese don't. They probably watch our stock market closer than we do.

There are some signs that the boom is beginning to slow up. The Japanese pointed with pride to their annual growth rate which they say still exceeds that of the Germans. Maybe so. You can see an enormous volume of construction going on everywhere. A new subway system in Tokyo is in the works and it's got the heart of the city torn up. Traffic is a mess.

ON CREDIT BASIS

You can sense, too, that a lot of this building is being done on credit. There is a close tie between government and industry with government helping a lot in the advances. It's a sort of state capitalism.

These days the Japanese have to import 20 percent of their foodstuffs just to maintain a subsistence level. The figure used to be 5 percent. They've become the world's greatest fishermen, way ahead of all other nations. They're fishing in the banks all over the world. It's an example of the almost frantic, continuous efforts to keep things in balance.

Recently they cut shipping rates to keep the maritime fleet busy. They must scramble to preserve the balance of trade. And you wonder how long the pace can be maintained and where it will end. Right now everything surges ahead. But you can't help but feel that a real bust might be in the offing.

The Japanese don't agree.

Politically, Japan seemed more stable than any place we visited. The paradox is that this great industrial giant of the Orient is not a military power. We wouldn't let them rearm and now the people don't want to. I asked again and again if there was sentiment for rearment and I nearly always got the same answer. There might be a few stray politicians who would like an army to play with but the people wouldn't stand for it. They would overthrow any government that tried to get into an arms race.

FOR SINGLE GOAL

For years the Japanese people almost starved under a tremendous tax burden. They sacrificed and dedicated their lives for the military might of the war lords. Their gamble failed for overlordship of the Pacific. They gambled with their attack on us and lost the game.

Now the people like this idea of money being poured into the civilian economy in-

stead of the military. That may be an oversimplification, but as a people, the Japanese have had it so much better since the war. It could be political suicide for leaders to drive for a change and rearm. This isn't my judgment but opinion I picked up in a good many talks around Tokyo. It may be a more Western attitude replacing, in part, the fatalistic, oriental approach to life.

As a matter of fact, you continually sensed the turn to the occidental world in Japan. You saw it in the clothes, the sports, the night clubs and the industrial technique.

Even the kimonos now are mostly reserved for ceremony. For example, I happened to stop at commencement exercises for a junior college. All the girls wore beautiful kimonos. But it turned out that most of these had been rented for the occasion. Nearly all the parents were in Western clothes.

SOME EXCEPTIONS

They have copied the West in so many things. I did, however, run into a taxi driver who refused a tip. That was an attitude he never picked up from either America or Europe. But it is indication of the restoration of Japanese pride and faith in their destiny after the sheer despair of crushing military defeat.

The bustle of people is perpetual. Every day Japan looks like Broadway when the theaters let out or a big stadium after the game. You wonder how this small island can support them all.

There are colleges and schools everywhere. You couldn't turn around without bumping into a swarm of students. Japan is emphasizing education and that might be part of the answer to industrial success. We happened to be there during a school vacation and the uniformed youngsters were out by the tens of thousands—many of them on tours like us and most of them taking pictures.

If you think the Americans are camera fiends, you should see the Japanese. It seemed like everyone in Japan was snapping shutters. When I got off the boat, toting a long cigar in a holder, four or five amateur photographers materialized and started snapping pictures. Not many people smoke in Japan and fewer still smoke big cigars. This was a photographic opportunity they couldn't resist. When I got rid of the cigar they melted away.

BIGGEST IN WORLD

Naturally I was interested in my own profession and in Tokyo I visited Asahi Shimbun, their top newspaper with the biggest circulation of any in the world—some 6 million. I found that they had a huge plant—in some respects more advanced than any in America.

What a contrast it was to the paper I visited in Bangkok. There, they had a flatbed press and dozens of women sitting around folding papers—the most primitive mailroom I've ever seen. That wasn't the case in Japan. The big Tokyo paper was the most modern operation you can imagine. It typified what you found in almost every line of manufacturing.

In Tokyo they told you that the United States should give more concern to buying Japanese products and no thought at all about keeping their products out. They need the trade. This was their big worry. They said again and again that Japan was one of our biggest customers and that they couldn't buy from us unless we buy from them.

Naturally they're keeping an eye on Red China. But I didn't find the concern on that subject that we exhibit. And this is true even though the giant of Red China is only miles away across the East China Sea and Japan is unarmed.

NO TRADE DEALS

Not long ago we got excited in the States because Japan sent a trade mission to China. They signed a lot of big contracts. What came of it? Absolutely nothing. China wanted credit and Japan is working that same side of the street. The deal fell through.

An eventual reconciliation between Korea and Japan could help, because Korea has a surplus of food. But the Koreans despise the Japanese. The feeling is not unlike the old Irish hostility toward England.

Don't get the idea that Japan is sitting there defenseless and helpless. She isn't. We have forbidden her to have an army and navy, so we've had to establish great defense bases of our own. We shield Japan and we pay the bill.

As I said before, the great bulk of the people don't mind. They are quite happy to have the government invest their taxes in the domestic economy. And of course there are the terrible memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Any mention of the atomic bomb is almost as shocking to the Japanese as irreverence toward the Emperor. He still is the symbol of authority, by the way.

I came to Japan with the feeling that I wouldn't care much for the people. I'd never quite gotten over Pearl Harbor. But their polite little bows, courtesy and charming manners won me over. Of course, I guess I like all people everywhere.

I believe the Japanese have feelings of real good will toward the United States. It's my guess that beneath those occidental shirts their Oriental hearts are beating with genuine friendship for us.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 17, 1963]

STRONG TIES IN FAR-OFF LANDS—KINSHIP OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND IS REASSURING TO AMERICANS—SHOW A ZEST FOR LIFE—PEOPLE, PROUD OF THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS, FIND SATISFACTION IN SPORTS

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Somehow it was like meeting up with kin-folk when, after several weeks of cruising among the balmy, carefree Pacific islands we finally arrived in New Zealand and Australia—way down under.

These are not ancient countries but young ones, younger even than we are. Sturdy, self-reliant and confident of the destiny which lies ahead rather than behind them, they stand as isolated but dependable bastions of Anglo-Saxon civilization. You understand them, and feel a tug of warm kinship in your heart.

HAVE COMMON ORIGINS

This only points up our worst problem in dealing with the teeming millions of the Orient. The roots of Australia and New Zealand go back to Britain; our own origins go back not only to Britain but to all of Europe. But we have no such link to the Orient.

It is idle to believe that we can ever fully understand the Oriental mind, with its complex thinking, religions and philosophies, or that they can completely understand us and get a true image of America. As the Orient, with its huge populations, grows into a more controlling power position in the world, this problem of understanding will be our worst hurdle.

As a people, we were woefully ignorant of Europe as recently as just before World War I. But ties of bloodlines, religion and ethnic sameness made for early understanding. Our ties with the Orient must be built from the ground up.

DRAWING US CLOSER

Distance is another limitation. You cannot realize what a tremendous expanse the Pacific Ocean is, in distance and time, until you cross it on a ship. Yet the Orient need not be remote forever. Jet air travel has

knit the world much closer, and when rocket travel eventually comes—as it will—spans between nations will become even narrower.

Even then, however, the bulk of the commerce between the Orient and the Western World will continue to move by sea. Admiral Mahon, the old prophet of seapower, is not obsolete in the vast area of the Pacific.

When I went on this trip I had no thought of inquiry or reporting; I went for a vacation and to get away. But, like the old firehorse, after getting through the tourism part of the trip and starting to bump into the fascinating problems of the Orient, it was just natural to start sticking my nose into finding out what was going on.

You couldn't find a better spot than the South Pacific to just sit and watch life go by. Most of those islands are out of this world and its troubles. If you want the simple life and little to worry about—taxes, deficit spending, Khrushchev, Mao, even Kennedy, nothing more serious than whether a coconut will drop on your head—this is the place.

SPOTS OF BEAUTY

Some of the islands are lovely, with the simple existence and the native dances. Tahiti was a disappointment, unless you want to join the beachcombers. Yet only 12 miles away, Moorea is exquisite and charming, one of the most breathtaking views of natural beauty anywhere.

Another lovely spot was Milford Sound, in southern New Zealand, a Norwegian-type fjord complete with glaciers and waterfalls. A little place in the Cook Islands, Rarotonga, was delightful because it was so primitive and the people so friendly. That and Bali, with its temples and quaint people, stand out in memory.

But when you pull into Auckland, New Zealand's busy port, you're back in the world streams with a bang. New Zealand is amazing, with just about everything in the way of scenery jamjacked into those two small islands.

PASTURES PREDOMINATE

Just average-sized cities, the largest about 400,000, but what a countryside. You can drive through miles and miles of rolling, pastoral landscapes, like a great park. Sheep by the millions—just thinking about them, let alone counting, would put you to sleep. And thousands of cattle, mostly Jerseys. New Zealand's economy is primarily agricultural, 90 to 95 percent of it, and what a job they do of it.

The view reminds you of the British Midlands, or the Pennsylvania Dutch farms, everything tidy. Something is missing, however—barns. The climate is such that livestock can be left outdoors the year round.

The farmers there have introduced the best blood lines into their livestock, and treated the soils with chemicals so the land can support twice or three times as many sheep. That farmland is not cheap, some of it has been in the same family for generations.

Seeing how dependent New Zealand is on agriculture, you realize just one of Prime Minister Macmillan's problems in trying to get Britain into the Common Market. He could ruin New Zealand and the Commonwealth with one misstep.

SOMETHING FOR ALL

The variety of the scenery is almost incredible: Strange regions of geysers and thermal springs, mountains, caves, glaciers, sandy beaches, great forests—largely built up with pine trees brought from California—and incomparable fishing lakes. Many on our tour took a day off to whip a line at those fabulous trout.

The people of New Zealand are delightful—Independent and individualistic—and their newspapers reflect it. This is virtually the last bulwark of independent papers; each city has its own distinctive, locally owned paper, no chain publications, something almost unheard of in the world today.

Just a few hours away by jet but more than 2 days on a ship lies Australia, New Zealand's big brother—only they don't so regard each other, but rather with mutual, friendly independence.

Australia is another story entirely. It has its giant sheep ranches, or stations, but they also are doing a pretty good job of industrializing. Sydney, the largest city, has a magnificent harbor and scenery, and has been called the San Francisco of Australia.

ACROSS BY AIR

You must think of this country as being as large as the United States—minus Alaska, of course. When we left the tour, we had to fly 14 hours across it to reboard the ship at another port. You get the feel of a young nation, with most of its life story still ahead.

Sheep, wheat, and dairying are basic to the economy, but the volume of industry surprises the visitor. General Motors, for example, builds many of the cars for the Orient there and has become so large that even in Australia, where they welcome outside capital, they are beginning to wonder about the sheer size of General Motors. Chrysler, and Ford are there too. Mining and production of electricity—and Australia needs more power—are other key industries. Production costs are high.

As every schoolboy knows, most of Australia's development and population lie in a narrow fringe along the seacoast, with most of the interior a vast desert. By conserving their water resources, they are making good headway pushing the productive belt inland, but it is a slow and expensive process.

GO IN FOR SPORTS

You soon understand why this little country, with only about 10 million people, wins so many world tennis prizes, swimming championships and international cricket matches. Australians are tall and strong from their outdoor life—like Californians—and they love sports.

At the beaches you see the colorful volunteer lifesaving clubs, and for the children, learning to swim is as compulsory as taking arithmetic in school. Melbourne has a stadium that seats 120,000, larger than any of ours, and it is filled frequently. The race tracks are magnificent, and racing news and odds on the horses are features in the papers.

The Australians, and the New Zealanders, are pretty well satisfied with the life they lead and wouldn't swap it for that of any other country—including the United States.

Despite their nation's relatively brief existence, they are very patriotic, and you see many memorials to World War I and II, the biggest events in their history. Canberra, the new capital started some years ago and still building between the rival cities of Sydney and Melbourne, has the finest war memorial to be seen anywhere.

CITY OF BEAUTY

Melbourne is one of the most livable cities to be found, with its wide streets, beautiful buildings and landscape plantings, all capped by two great universities.

Australia is much more a welfare state than we are, and they like it. Yet the private-investment, profit motive is still in the picture. Tremendous amounts of American money—and much British—are pouring into their business life. The cities are modern and the transportation good, especially the air service which is essential in such a country.

Over the years, a system of industrial courts, which practically amounts to compulsory arbitration, has been built up. Both labor and management gripe a lot about it but neither would do away with it. The system hasn't worked perfectly, by any means, but major strikes are almost unheard of.

Australian labor, once violently leftist has become conservative because of the pressure of world communism—they certainly don't want to get into that category. For the most part, the country enjoys industrial peace, in sharp contrast to our recent needless strikes in the States, in which both sides as well as the public lost.

I frankly don't know if the Australian system would work in our country; I doubt it. We will just have to find our own remedy.

ALL FOR IT

I was interested also in their medical aid program, on which the doctors and everyone over there go along. It was not thrust on them but developed gradually. Patients are free to choose their own doctor and hospital in this state medicare plan.

Curiously, in Australia we were asked not so much about business, Wall Street or foreign policy as we were asked why all the fuss over medicare. You could explain that the American people are prepared to provide care for the aged but there is a wide divergence on how, yet they just couldn't see why there would be any debate. Australians accept the welfare state and just wonder why everyone else doesn't have it.

There is, of course, a catch to this apparent paradise—as always. You pay for everything you get, and their taxes would be considered staggering over here. Still the workers have become accustomed to paying out big amounts for various phases of security.

HAVE TIGHT CONTROLS

The handling of the immigration and racial problem in Australia and New Zealand is intriguing. Both set out to be Anglo-Saxon outposts with immigration strictly limited, yet over the years that policy has been relaxed because they needed people. They don't lay down sharp regulations which could become offensive and cause trouble. Both nations are essentially homogeneous.

Immigration bodies decide who can be admitted as a permanent citizen, and this may extend even to oriental students studying in their universities. But one sees few orientals or Negroes in either nation.

As much as Australia wants to expand, they limit immigration to what can be absorbed without undue burden on their job market, schools, and the like, hence the slow growth rate. They will take anyone who can contribute to their economy or culture, and they advertise widely those trades in which people are needed.

I doubt such a system would work in our melting pot Nation, but it does there, and with a minimum of friction. And they can't understand all the racial troubles in South Africa.

CLOSER TO IT

The overwhelming problem for Australia and New Zealand is the rising tide of nationalism in the oriental countries north of them. If all this ferment threatens world peace in the future, think what it means for these two isolated centers of Anglo-Saxon civilization down under.

The recent settlement by which the Dutch simply had to hand over Western New Guinea to Indonesia brings the Indonesians right up to the Australian mandate over the rest of the island, and a clash may be expected. It is a thinly populated and hard to defend territory.

The Australians are keeping up their armaments, especially their splendid air force. They were buying some French jets while we were there. And they are maintaining their ties with the motherland, as shown by the recent visit of Queen Elizabeth. Their bonds with the Commonwealth are strong, yet they remain fiercely independent—neither Britain nor the United States could tell them what to do and get very far.

They appreciate that the British navy and American nuclear might up to now have

contained the march of communism. And we won't let them down; it wouldn't be to our interest to do so. In Australia and New Zealand, you seldom hear them speak of this rising tide of racism to the north. You get the feeling that here is a people confident of their strength and future, looking ahead to their destiny unafraid.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 18, 1963]

HOLDING ACTION IN THE ORIENT—UNITED STATES CAN EXPECT FEW REAL SUCCESSES AGAINST COMMUNISM IN FAR EAST—A MYRIAD OF PROBLEMS—OVERSHADOWING ALL OTHERS IS THE ECONOMIC DISTRESS FOUND EVERYWHERE

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Still unwritten and unresolved is the answer to an all-important question: Are we winning or losing the battle with communism for the Far East?

Obviously, we definitely are on the defensive. Possibly too much so.

Yet by the very nature of the situation, defense is the only realistic posture for the free world. The basic elements of the problem dictate a policy of containment. It's a holding action.

AT LOW POINT

In Asia, the tide ebbs and flows. Sometimes we appear to be making headway. Then success runs out. When I made my first odyssey to the Far East our fortunes definitely were at low tide.

Time was too limited on my trip to gather up many pieces of the picture puzzle. You can't make solid judgments on the basis of a visit that was all too sketchy.

But my impression was that our position in Asia adds up to a series of plus and minus factors—and right now the minus sign predominates. By no means is the situation hopeless. It isn't a debacle. But as the Communists peck away, first at this spot, then at another, we're losing ground, not gaining.

Yet I came back home thankful that it wasn't worse.

In military terms you call it logistics—the problems of supply complicated by time and distance. The Orient is mighty far away, thousands upon thousands of miles from home base. You can consider this problem of distance from the viewpoint of the other side. Mr. Khrushchev, for instance, quickly retreated from the confrontation in Cuba. He knew that the logistical factors were overwhelmingly against him for a showdown in the Caribbean.

RED CHINA SPHERE

Yet we are trying to contain communism in the distant Far East. And although that strategic area may be thousands of miles from Moscow, it's right in the back yard of Red China, a more ruthless, uncompromising and even tougher foe than the Kremlin.

Another fact that we mustn't forget is this, and it's an overriding fact: Everywhere—in Indonesia, Thailand, China, all through the Pacific—we are dealing, not with millions, but hundreds of millions of people. The sheer mass of humanity is almost overwhelming.

Moreover, the bulk of these people are just existing on the razor-edge of subsistence. Their great concern is not freedom or even ideologies. They just want enough food to stay alive. It's a naked matter of physical survival. The following observations are minor points, but they serve to illustrate: We saw practically no elderly people in the Orient.

You didn't pay much attention to this at first. But gradually it dawned on you: In Asia they don't have much of a problem of medical care for the aged simply because so few survive beyond the middle years. They just don't live very long. The life span is amazingly short.

Another thing. You see very few fat people in the Far East. There are exceptions, of course, but they are rare. There isn't enough food to go around. What there is generally consists of rice sweetened with a bit of fruit and fish. The national pastime of Americans is to go on diets, exercise and lose weight. In Asia they spend their waking moments trying to find enough to eat.

ON TINY PLOTS

You watch the patient peasants toiling in their tiny rice paddies and wonder what kind of approach you can make to those masses. The little rice plots that represent food for generations of a single family wouldn't be good enough for a flower garden over here. How can we find a common ground for communication, let alone understanding? Those peasants don't envy the American working-man with his home and car. They can't even imagine such an existence. And there are million upon million of them.

What a fertile field they are for the Communists to till. And what a difficult problem they are for us to reach. Then you can add the centuries of racial pride—"Asia for the Asiatics"—with thoughts of imperialism mixed up in simple minds. The difficulties are multiplied over and over.

Yet there can be absolutely no doubt that these hundreds of millions in the Orient are stirring.

Still another major and very basic element is the fact that many of these are new nations. There is no political entity, large or small, quite so truculent, belligerent or difficult as a new nation. As we say out on a Kansas farm, "They're feeling their oats." That's what is happening in the Orient.

JUST CAN'T PRODUCE

Independence, and throwing off the hated, so-called colonialism, sound wonderful in theory. But independence doesn't produce food. It doesn't necessarily make for wise government. It doesn't even mean that the masses are better off than they were before. The new Asian nations all want to take the quick short route to utopia without facing up to the fact that it's not a pathway strewn with roses, breadfruit or even coconuts.

Generally, it's sad but true: The newer the country and the more it desperately needs to build a stable economy, the greater the emphasis on arms and military trappings. You see gold braid and military toys everywhere.

One thing is certain. They may have thrown off their old masters, but they are quick to get a new bureaucracy and a new set of overlords. True, the new rulers may be their own. But they can be just as oppressive as the old, and sometimes they aren't as intelligent.

You can't deny that the masses of the East have been gouged and oppressed through the centuries by the foreign devils and by their own. But neither can anyone expect the bonds of the past to be snapped overnight and the new world to appear as if by magic.

SOME WERE GOOD

For that matter, I came home feeling that we have made too much a fetish of the word "colonialism." There have been brands of colonialism that actually benefited the masses at one time or another. And there has been the other kind that exploited and degraded them. Now we are paying for the bad kind in terms of latent distrust by millions in Asia.

The above observations on colonialism may be heresy and I certainly don't mean to imply that the aspirations of nationalism are bad or that all the new leaders are without ideals. Everywhere you heard of the great stress on education. That's fine, and there is a tremendous emphasis on it.

But with the exception of Japan, education hasn't trickled down to the teeming masses. I'm afraid it will be a long time before the schools can produce the educated

classes that a broad industrial society demands. In the meantime, education at home and abroad is producing an elite that will be the leaders of tomorrow. These are the ones we should try to befriend and influence now. It's easy to sit here at home and develop various themes on what ought to be done to save Asia. It's another thing entirely to come face to face with the stark reality of the other side of the world and realize how little you know about it.

For instance, it has been said, and I have agreed, that the U.N. ought to put new nations on probation for a few years before granting membership. Sort of let them get out of the tribal stage before they get a vote.

I advanced this theory at a dinner in Bangkok to a government official who had spent much time in the Orient. He shrugged his shoulders and said: "How long a period of probation do you have in mind? Thirty years? Forty years? Or maybe 50, 60, or 70 years?"

His point was plain. Obviously it would be better to take the new countries into the family of nations and try to work with them than to let them stay outside and go their own ways. In short, there is no quick trip to effective self-government. I imagine what is true in Asia is magnified in Africa. This is the background you must understand to talk of dealing with communism in the Orient.

VITAL TO POLICY

Take Indonesia as a classic example. Vietnam is vital to our prestige and containment policy in the Far East. In fact, observers told me that if we lose there we might as well pack up and go home. Yet for the long future, Indonesia is certainly as important and possibly much more explosive.

Indonesia ought to be the garden spot of southeast Asia. It has everything to make it a great nation. It is a rich country of more than 100 million right now. It has oil, minerals and the usual products of the tropics. Its soil is fertile and it should be a great reservoir of surplus food. In natural resources you might have to rate it third behind the United States and Russia in the entire world. Yet with all its blessings, this new nation isn't writing a very happy record.

From Singapore to Tokyo, a great many informed observers believe that Indonesia is headed for an awful blow-up. Already there have been more attempts on Sukarno's life than on De Gaulle's.

From friendly sources I heard Sukarno described as the Wendell Willkie of the Orient—whatever that may mean. From others I heard that he was a sensuous playboy and exploiter of his people—and at the same time, one of the most dangerous and wily politicians in Asia.

Frankly, I don't know enough about him to reach a judgment. I did see one of his magnificent palaces in Bali. On the basis of that luxurious building, I would say that while he may sympathize with the masses, he certainly does live well.

PLACE OF BEAUTY

Bali, by the way, is a picture book island that lives up fully to tourist expectations. It is beautiful. But even there the poverty of the masses is a jarring note. And it is one of Sukarno's showplaces.

We've poured hundreds of millions into Indonesia to keep it from going Communist. Yet Sukarno continues to throw his weight around against the West—the United States, the Dutch, and now, against the proposed Maylasia Federation that could be a member of the British Commonwealth.

The Russians, too, have hauled rubles and aid, including weapons, to Sukarno. Their contributions amount to only slightly less than ours. It's no secret that Indonesia is a spot where the United States is coldly reviewing its aid policy. The Russians, in turn, aren't too happy with what they've gotten

for their investment. Currently, the native Communists are demanding more representation in the government.

Again and again the situation in Indonesia has stopped just short of the exploding point. But the volcano hasn't gone up yet. Some think a push from the right by the army might succeed. Others think a Communist shove from the left might swing the country in that direction.

As adroit as Sukarno has been playing one off against the other, you suspect that he can't go on indefinitely. Some observers believe the country might wind up with a sort of Tito-brand communism—not under Moscow or Peking, and certainly not under us. Yet the situation goes on.

HAS STRICT CURBS

As I said Indonesia ought to be the rice bowl of the East, but food is a problem. When we were there, for instance, we ran into the strict regulation of exchange. Everybody was warned not to take dollars or traveler's checks ashore. You found the people ready to pay anything for goods—a shirt, even a lipstick. The official rate of exchange was 178 Indonesian units for a dollar. We found that the crew members, who ignored the warnings, were getting from 500 to 600. And at Singapore, we were told that the actual rate was about 1,500 to the dollar. That's a measure of the runaway inflation in Indonesia. Generally, it's a sure sign of blowup.

If Indonesia should swing violently to the extreme left—and it might—that would be a definite, positive loss, because it would sever our line to Australia and New Zealand, if nothing else.

So this potentially rich, powerful nation is a dangerous question mark. I'm afraid that its leaning toward Communist China is too obvious to be denied.

Burma, too, is full of unrest. In fact, you could hardly find a place in southeast Asia that wasn't in trouble now or facing tremendous difficulties.

CLAIMS ARE VARIED

I didn't get to South Vietnam, so I wouldn't attempt to discuss it in detail. But apparently it's a touch-and-go battle. From the outside I heard that our claims of progress are too optimistic and that our reports of failure are exaggerated. The final answer isn't written yet.

On the constructive side you can look at the very important effort to bring the Malay peninsula, Sarawak and North Borneo into existence as Malaysia and a Commonwealth nation under British tutelage. Sukarno is rattling the sword and making threats at the prospect.

But if the development does go through it would represent a very positive gain. Certainly Singapore and the peninsula are key crossroads of the Orient. Singapore is 85 percent Chinese and all of Malaysia about 50 percent. But unlike Indonesia, where the departed Dutch left a vacuum in know-how and technology, Malay is working closely with the British. It still is a bustling, prosperous spot, better off than most places in the Orient.

NOT VERY SMOOTH

In all these countries it was obvious that a gradual transition from the old colonial status to independence would have been beneficial. But that simply didn't happen in the great onrush of nationalism. In Singapore harbor you can see 60 or 70 abandoned freighters, just hulks and mostly Dutch. These ships used to carry most of the coastal cargo for Indonesia.

Thailand is a contrast. With its beautiful city of Bangkok it seemed to have a particular flavor of the Orient all its own. Certainly it seemed more tranquil and stable than other nations we visited. Unquestionably it is prosperous. We've done a good job there.

Without doubt, Thailand would like to cling to the West. But the constant pressure and pecking away by the Communists could bring battle to that peaceful land. Again, I'd say that Thailand—and Bangkok with its temples—is a tourist must. It's hot but colorful, romantic and with good food and hotels.

You'd have to catalog and assess each country separately—and there are a lot of new countries now in the wake of rising nationalism. Curiously, to me, India doesn't seem to be much of a factor. And this, despite her rank as the second most populous nation in the world and one of the great landmasses of the continent.

As a people and a nation, the Orientals seem to regard India as entirely apart from the rest. Because of that, I doubt that India ever could lead Asia. India is land and culture to itself.

CHINA THEIR FRIEND

The United States has placed its bets on India to demonstrate that freedom and a democratic system can bring better living standards than the Communist dictatorship of China. But until you're there, you don't realize that the kinship of southeast Asia is directed toward China, not India. To my intense surprise, I found strong anti-Communists who were somewhat delighted when Mao gave Nehru his comeuppance in the border invasion.

Everywhere you heard that we'd done a real job in making Formosa a showplace economically and in education. But we haven't gotten very far in spreading concepts of liberty in Formosa. Old Chiang is a dictator and probably will be as long as he lives.

We were told that South Vietnam and North Vietnam together would make a strong nation but that political division makes this impossible. By the same token, North and South Korea could make it if they were joined. In the meantime, South Korea will have to be supported. Right now, we're the ones who have to do the supporting. The job will go on for years.

HARD TO COMPREHEND

And so it went, Asia is complex, almost unfathomable. The economic distress, the differences of religion, the exploitation of the people, the caste systems—these are the problems not of years but of centuries. On top of these are piled the growing pains of the new nations.

And always there is that massive fact of enormous population, symbolized by the potential power of those 800 million people behind the Bamboo Curtain. And counting those on the outside, we're talking in terms of more than a billion human beings.

When you view all these imponderables and consider the ramifications in each country, you come home, not wondering why we are on the defensive, but how we've done as well as we have.

The problems of Asia are with us now and for the long pull ahead. They are ancient problems. The West will be living with them for decades, if not centuries. And the West, itself, will be ancient before they are resolved.

That's for certain.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 19, 1963]

CAN FIND PRIDE IN U.S. RECORD—HAWAII AND PHILIPPINES ARE BRIGHT SPOTS IN NATION'S FOREIGN POLICY—IMPACT ON FAR EAST—BUT BIGGEST AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION IS CONTINUATION OF STABLE ECONOMY

(By Roy A. Roberts)

As our odyssey to the Orient ends, a little flag waving may be pardonable. I came home deeply proud of my country and the leadership it is offering in these years of swift change and a new look in the world.

Mistakes and blunders—yes, waste and millions of dollars down the drain—yes, but

overall a tremendous achievement. Personally I can't subscribe to the cult of the ugly American. It should be instead the magnificent American.

LOOK TO STABLE UNITED STATES

Here and now let me record not just an impression but a strong conviction I brought home: We might weather a pretty sizable military setback but the whole facade of a free world front which we have worked so hard to build in Europe and the Orient could crumble if we ever suffer a major economic bust at home.

Too much of our world position, strength and influence depends on a strong domestic economy, even granting the obvious, that our nuclear striking power today is the potent shield of the free world, in every part of the globe.

I wonder if we're paying enough attention here at home to the efficiency of our industrial complex and the soundness of our dollar. Both are just as vital, maybe more so, as more missiles, more Polaris submarines, more military bases. Don't ever forget that.

Several times now I have suggested that the basic problem of the Orient is not one of immediate urgency, but lies in the decades ahead. Our nuclear power, plus the costly chain of bases erected to contain communism in oriental waters, is strong enough to assure our national security against threats from that quarter for years to come.

Whether the billion and more people of the Far East can be galvanized into a future threat to us is unanswerable, but one thing is dead sure—you can't ignore it.

A BRIGHT SPOT

Naturally you notice the danger and trouble signs more than the plus values, because they hit you harder, but we have much to our credit in the Orient. The admission of Hawaii as a full-fledged, not a second-class member of our Union, is one of the smartest things we have ever done.

Its significance may not percolate down through the hundreds of millions of common people in the Orient, but it certainly has left an impression on the thinking of the leaders.

On the mainland we think largely of Hawaii in terms of a tropical paradise. Actually it represents our most definite and almost sole blood line to the Orient. The Japanese are the largest bloodstock there, the Chinese next and the native, or Polynesian, next before you encounter the Anglo-Saxon strain.

Now all this racial admixture has been accepted into our commonwealth of States. I wonder if we have made enough of this fact in trying to convey a better image of America in the Far East.

LED THEM ALONG

The Philippines, how we tutored them for generations—not only in education but in economics and government—until they were ready to govern themselves. And finally, without pressure, cutting the ties to give them complete independence. We can all take pride in that chapter of American world leadership.

Probably our biggest achievement in the Orient, since the war, has been our contribution in rebuilding Japan from the ashes of destruction, just as we picked up prostrate Germany in Europe.

History has recorded no such paradox: Vanquished nations, instead of being exploited and held in subjugation, restored through the assistance—and in Japan's case complete guidance—of the victor. True, we had a self-interest in both cases; the challenge of world communism now offered a greater menace than these two former foes. Helping them recover promoted world stability, and thereby, world peace.

CAN'T HELP US

All this struck you more forcibly in Japan than in Western Europe, because Japan is not a military ally, in any sense. We have been

her shield and still are. Given the opportunity to rebuild along democratic lines, she has made the most of it, but Japan hasn't a ship or a soldier to add to our defense line in the Far East.

These are things which we Americans, pessimistically viewing our mistakes, too often overlook.

Here and there in the Orient, seething with nationalism and racism and hanging in the balance on communism, are spots such as Formosa, Thailand, and South Korea. Turbulent South Korea, independent and still groping toward its destiny, has been given that chance by our vital economic assistance.

Of course there have been mistakes and millions lost on bad bets. You could find enough examples to make a case for failure, yet you can't help feeling that we will realize something better than regrets from it all.

A TOUGH COMPETITOR

Another vivid impression from the Orient: Just as rebuilt Western Europe now challenges us in world markets, so is Japan becoming a tough competitor on the other side of the globe.

It makes you almost sick at heart to enter the fine big seaports of the Orient and see so few American flags on the many ships docked there. Our continuous wage and price spiral has reached a point of real concern about our ability to keep a place in world markets and industry. It has largely driven from the seas all except a few large shipping lines which keep going only on huge subsidies at taxpayer cost.

It used to be, also, that the United States had a virtual monopoly on airplane sales over the world. It gives you a jolt to learn how this has changed now. In Australia, for instance, you see the wide use of French—not American—commercial airliners. And you read headlines about Australian purchases of new French fighter-bombers.

You wonder where it will all end and when we will begin to pay more heed to our role in a global, and not just a national, economy.

MUST SPEED UP

Aside from peace itself, this stands as our foremost problem today—getting our economic growth rolling once more, and on a world-competitive basis.

Folks at home can properly ask if all our billions expended for bases, aid and containment in the Far East are worthwhile. You see and feel the obvious answer touring the fringe of the Orient: Can we afford to surrender more than 1½ billion people to communism, to be exploited and built into their machine, simply by default?

I doubt that a cruise such as ours made any votes for foreign aid, though. The American businessmen aboard, most of them retired, looked at the impressive new development out there and thought, "My tax money helped pay for that." And they were probably right.

Yet foreign aid is as definite a part of our foreign policy as nuclear and military strength, and we must continue it. It should, however, be restudied and revalued continuously for realism and results. Just cutting it back indiscriminately isn't the answer.

NEED TRUE PICTURE

I came home also with a very definite feeling that we're not getting across in the Orient a true picture of what we seek. Our sheer good will and exuberance make us suspect in this hemisphere where backslapping and fervent handshakes evoke mistrust. Conveying the idea that our intentions are not exploitation or imperialism is an almost insurmountable job among those great, inert masses of people. A correspondent, on leave from Vietnam, put his finger on one aspect of the problem at lunch in Tokyo:

"We'd win this thing easy if the soldiers we're training—they're not bad soldiers—had

the heart and fighting spirit the Commies do. Our boys fight all right mechanically, but the unseen enemy who springs on them, usually from ambush, is a dedicated revolutionary."

Our position in the Orient is complicated by the fact that in several instances we have had to back regimes that are unpopular with their own people. It's a just criticism, but we didn't create these regimes; we have to do what we can with what we find. And this may not be our worst complication, that of being billed as new colonialists, moving in to oppress them as the French did. Bunk, of course, but it goes over in not too well informed minds.

KEY IN YOUTHS

It is obvious that our efforts must be directed at youth, especially the students, who are the catalyst of ferment in the East and will be the governing leaders of tomorrow. They are young and we must meet them with young people—that is why Bobby Kennedy's quick excursion through the Far East was good strategy, not so much for what he said but in the appeal to youth.

Americans have been visiting the Orient for a long time, but always cost, distance, and time have been limiting factors. Now the restless flood of American tourism, after wearing out the pathways of Europe, is veering to the Far East.

Jet travel helps this along, of course, but you are amazed, also, at the fine hotel accommodations in most of the Orient. Some of the new hotels, such as the Southern Cross in Melbourne with its fancy shopping arcade, match anything in the States. And even the most primitive ones we encountered on our trip were passable, and so interesting as to make up for any shortage of comforts.

There was one little place in Port Moresby, in the Australian part of New Guinea. It was located in a lush tropical setting, and the weather was stinking hot.

TO REBOARD SHIP

We had flown all night to Port Moresby to reboard the ship after leaving it in Sydney to spend more days in Australia. The waiters and other hotel help were bush boys from the interior, barefoot, wearing loin cloths, friendly grins and little else. Ordering a meal, you pointed to the number of your selection on the menu and they went after it. Yet even here they brought in pitchers of iced tea and ice water—they had dealt with our Air Force and Army boys and knew what Americans like.

As this tide of American tourists swings toward the Orient, it cannot help but cut down our long-range problem of understanding.

One other thought from that part of the world deserves mention. There is real concern over there as to how long the United States will maintain its present policy.

The anti-United Nations, anti-foreign-aid rantings of the John Birchers are creating fear that this country will retreat from its world leadership role. They point out that the U.N., which we no longer control, soon will take steps very unpopular in this country. Will we then abandon or scuttle the U.N.?

TAKE CALMER VIEW

You can explain that these rantings are a passing phenomenon, just like the occasional leftwing outbursts, and that the United States basically follows a middle-of-the-road policy supported by both parties.

Still it raises a question in your own mind. I can only give my personal conviction on this: After my look-see at the other side of the globe I feel more strongly than ever that, imperfect as it is and disappointing as it has been, the U.N. still is needed by the world as a meeting place and a buffer for quarrels, if nothing else. The only alternative offers a bleak prospect for peace, indeed.

Right now the United Nations carries more prestige in the Orient than ever before with U Thant, a Burmese, as Secretary General. His appointment, and his success in the job, have done more to give the Far East pride and hope than any single recent event.

A final word, on Hawaii, which was our last port of call. In my first visit since it became a State, I had heard that the influx from the States, the rapid growth, had turned it into a honky-tonk. Sheer rubbish. Hawaii is as lovely as ever. It has that beautiful tropical setting, without the picturesque temples and mosques of the Far East, but also without that awful heat.

It is certain to become one of our biggest States in both population and influence. I never saw a South Sea island I would trade it for.

In Los Angeles, our passage through immigration and customs was the most courteous ever encountered. Then, as we waited in the fine new air terminal to fly home to Kansas City, the loudspeaker buzzed and a voice said:

"Mr. Civella, paging Mr. Nick Civella."

Hearing the name of that North Side figure of considerable notoriety, I knew we were nearing home.

The biggest lesson I learned in the Orient was that we had better acquire some of their philosophy of patience—and then more understanding. Because the Orient, and the problems of its hundreds of millions of people, will be with us for a long, long time.

GORDON R. CLAPP, A FINE PUBLIC SERVANT

MR. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished families in Wisconsin is the Clapp family. For many years members of this family have served the public interest in high public office.

Gordon Clapp, formerly head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, died a few days ago. His service in the Tennessee Valley Authority will always be an inspiration to anyone who is interested in clean, honorable, effective, and efficient administration.

But Gordon Clapp was more than merely a competent administrator. He believed deeply in what the TVA stands for.

The death of Gordon Clapp has been discussed editorially in some of the leading newspapers in the country, including those in Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a fine editorial entitled "Gordon R. Clapp," which was published in the Washington Post; an outstanding editorial entitled "Dreamer With a Shovel," which was published in the Washington Star; and an editorial entitled "Society Loses a Valuable Citizen in Death of Gordon Clapp," which was published in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis.

I may say that Gordon Clapp is survived by Norman M. Clapp, the present Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, who also has a splendid record of public service.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

GORDON R. CLAPP

Almost all of Gordon Clapp's crowded, productive life was devoted to public service in the areas of conservation and resource de-

velopment. He was in the great tradition of the American pioneer—a pursuer of horizons and an opener of frontiers. For 20 years, from its very beginning, he played a vital role in the growth of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the last 8 of them as its chairman. His imagination and zeal contributed invaluably to the effectiveness of that beneficial agency in reinvigorating, enriching and democratizing a great region of the United States. When he left the TVA in 1954, he served for a short while as Deputy City Administrator of New York and then became president of the Development and Resources Corp., a private concern with wide interests in the promotion of progress in far parts of the earth.

Gordon Clapp combined the best qualities of the educator and the entrepreneur. He was a man of learning with much theoretical knowledge who had at the same time a knack for getting things done. He believed deeply in the best values of democracy and applied them wherever he worked so that individual freedom and improved race relations and social advancement were by-products of his efforts to promote economic development. His untimely death at 57 is a heavy loss to a Nation which has grown to greatness on the basis of just such qualities and capacities.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 1, 1963]

DREAMER WITH A SHOVEL

Gordon R. Clapp, dead now at 57, devoted over a third of his good and useful life to the Tennessee Valley Authority. He began working there in 1933, when it was one of the coming wonders of the world, and he did not leave it until 1954. Indeed, he probably would never have left it had not President Eisenhower, in keeping with the more or less inexorable laws of politics, decided to name somebody else as TVA's Chairman.

This was something that Mr. Clapp never resented, nor had he any reason to. As far as the political realities went, he knew what the score was, and he took it for granted. He understood the need for high-echelon personnel changes as part of the transition from one presidential administration to another. Certainly he was anything but a complainer in that sense. As he once told an interviewer, "When a public servant gets a martyr complex, chances are he has been working too hard, or his friends have been feeling too sorry for him."

Mr. Clapp was happily free of any such complex. In all the various posts he held at TVA, he liked to think of himself as one of those "dreamers with shovels" who converted the Tennessee River into a tool that gave the people "better farms, better homes, and better living." It did just that, and his role in the enterprise was big. He deserves to be remembered as one of our country's fine public servants.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times] SOCIETY LOSES A VALUABLE CITIZEN IN DEATH OF GORDON CLAPP

Wisconsin feels keenly the death of Gordon Clapp, a member of a distinguished Wisconsin family who died in New York Sunday after a life of distinguished achievement in public and private pursuits.

The Clapp family is well and widely known in this State. Gordon was active in educational pursuits and was serving in a high administrative capacity when he went to the Tennessee Valley Authority with David Lilienthal, another distinguished Wisconsinite.

He rose to take Lilienthal's place at the head of this world-famed experiment in democratic planning and later became associated with Lilienthal in private business.

His brother, Norman, has also had a distinguished career. He was an aide to the late Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., later

became an editor and publisher in Lancaster, and is now the chief administrator of the rural electrification program in Washington.

It is a tragedy for the family, but it is a tragedy for society, too, to have a man whose talents are at their peak taken by death.

INFRINGEMENT ON THE RIGHT OF A STATE TO ACT AND ADMINISTER ITS OWN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on April 8, the Illinois State Senate passed a resolution in opposition to any legislation by the Congress which would infringe on the right of a State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation law. I submit the resolution of the Illinois Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 34 OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the Congress of the United States by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956 to 1962, has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and disease; and

Whereas the State workmen's compensation laws were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases, and their administration has, for over 50 years, been the function of the several State industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases constitute a severe threat to the survival of State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Senate is opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of this State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation law, and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs and strongly urges that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the State workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and diseases; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States; Secretary of Labor of the United States; Senate minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Illinois. Adopted by the senate, April 8, 1963.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

DEATH OF MRS. H. D. BURROUGHS, JR.

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I noted that on April 28, 1963, Mrs. H. D.

Burroughs, Jr., the distinguished wife of Henry D. Burroughs, Jr., an Associated Press photographer, died at the Bethesda Hospital. She was a niece of the distinguished author, Sherwood Anderson, and achieved fame and distinction in her own right in many fields of activity.

She was on assignment to Berlin after World War II and while there organized the Ladies of the Press Corps to aid the children in a German orphanage with food, clothing, and entertainment.

She was so very well known to all members of the press photographers and her passing is noted with deep regret.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the budget for the fiscal year 1964 makes provision for implementing the Alliance for Progress for a total sum of \$900 million and in due course this item will come to the Senate in the form of an appropriation bill from the House and will then be considered first by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and ultimately by the Senate itself.

I have devoted some time to this activity and to the progress or lack of progress made under this program. To say the least, a volatile and unstable condition has been developing in Latin America which inspires grave doubts that any progress is being made whatsoever in achieving social reforms and the investment of U.S. development capital in the Latin American Republics.

A great many speeches and articles have appeared during the last year indicating diverse points of view and since the amount of money involved and requested is very substantial indeed, it is appropriate that the Congress carefully reexamine the entire program and ascertain what course of action to pursue. The very fact that private capital is leaving rather than going to Latin American Republics in larger amounts is a cause for concern. It was the hope of the authors of the program that in due course private capital in sufficient quantities would move into these countries and make it possible ultimately for the U.S. Government to disengage itself from these activities and commitments.

The further fact that private Latin American capital is moving out of these countries to find safe haven elsewhere is in itself a cause for real concern.

In order to place the whole problem before the Congress and the country, I am submitting a number of items for inclusion with my remarks, all of which deal with the Alliance for Progress.

The first is an address delivered by Dr. William J. Kemnitzer, economic geologist and lecturer in Hispanic American Studies at Stanford University, at the second public affairs seminar at Elmhurst College in Elmhurst, Ill.

The second is an article by Dan Smoot, author of the Dan Smoot Report of Dallas, Tex., which appears in two parts.

The third is a specially prepared article by Mr. Simon G. Hanson, editor of Hanson's Latin American Letter, which was prepared at my request and which is

a penetrating study of what is happening under the Alliance for Progress.

The fourth is another weekly letter by Mr. Simon Hanson, dated December 29, 1962.

The fifth is a column submitted to the Tampa Tribune and published on May 18, 1962, under the caption "Before Castro, Bolivia."

The sixth is still another of Hanson's Latin American Letters, dated February 2, 1963.

The seventh is an article from the Time magazine entitled "Alliance in Danger."

The eighth is another Hanson's Latin American Letter, dated March 23, 1963, in the nature of a response to the "Report on the Alliance for Progress" prepared by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

The ninth is still another of Mr. Hanson's Latin American Letters dated March 30, 1963.

The 10th is the Washington report of the American Security Council, edited by Frank J. Johnson, which was issued February 25, 1963, under the caption "Brazil: The Tottering Keystone."

The 11th is an article from the New Leader by Keith Botsford, under the title "Slide-Rule Failure in Brazil," which appeared in the April 15, 1963, issue of the New Leader.

The 12th is an abstract of a report made on February 2, 1963, by Mr. J. Peter Grace, Chairman of the Commerce Department Committee for the Alliance for Progress. The full memorandum is too long to be included in the RECORD but I believe the abstracts and clippings incorporated in this memorandum will do full justice to the findings of that committee.

I believe that the cost involved in inserting these exhibits for the RECORD is fully justified in view of the obligations we have assumed under the Alliance for Progress and because it represents a heavy burden upon the Federal Treasury whether the commitments are made in the form of long-term, low-interest-rate loans or in the form of grants.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the exhibits to which I have referred.

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

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM—ITS OBJECTIVES, ORIGIN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND CHANCES FOR SUCCESS

(Address by William J. Kemnitzer¹ at the Second Public Affairs Seminars, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill., November 5, 1962)

The Alliance for Progress is a joint program of action established by adoption of the Charter of Punta del Este by representatives of 20 of the member-nations of the Organization of American States, meeting on the ministerial level of Junta del Este, Uruguay, on August 17, 1961. Cuba did not sign the Charter.

The stated purpose of the Alliance for Progress is " * * * to enlist the full energies of the peoples and governments of the Latin American Republics in a great cooperative effort to accelerate the economic and social

development of the participating countries of Latin America, so that they may achieve maximum levels of well-being, with equal opportunity for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires."

The reasons for the Alliance are many but the main motive for it is, undoubtedly, the desire to combat communism and other social and political movements prejudicial to democratic forms of government and capitalistic systems of economy which movements have been gaining impetus throughout much of Latin America for some time.

Demagogic leaders in many parts of Latin America, many of them aided and abetted from outside Communist sources, have harangued the masses into believing that their poor plight has been due to the unequal distribution of wealth caused by "imperialists" from the United States together with their co-partners, the gringoized Latin American oligarchy.

This anti-United States propaganda poured out in an atmosphere of continuing destitution is most effective among the underprivileged which constitute the bulk of the Latin American populace. They readily believe capitalist democracy as applied to Latin America from the outside to be simply another form of colonialism, a system which exploited them for three centuries prior to their independence from the mother country.

They are told that this independence was not the result of a true revolution of the people; it was merely a transference of the same system for exploitation from one group to another. Now, with the powerful backing of the Sino-Soviet governments, they are told the time has come for the real social revolution.

The growing intensity and scope of these attacks upon democratic methods in Latin America has posed a serious problem for the Western Nations in general and for the United States in particular as virtual custodian of democracy in this hemisphere. To combat these attacks and prevent establishment of governments hostile to capitalist democracy, the Latin American Republics except for Cuba, under the leadership of the United States, hope by means of the program set up under the Alliance for Progress to create or modify conditions in Latin America which will motivate the masses to reject communism and other forms of socio-political economy alien to our desired way of life in the Americas.

The Charter of Punta del Este establishes the Alliance for Progress within the framework of Operation Pan America. Operation Pan America is a plan submitted by the Government of Brazil on August 19, 1958, to the governments of the other American Republics through their diplomatic representatives in Rio de Janeiro. It called for a reorientation of hemispheric policy intended to place Latin America in a position to participate more effectively in the defense of the West. It was, however, more than a program; it was a policy.

Operating within the framework of the Operation Pan America, the Alliance for Progress not only provides for a program designed to bring a better life to the peoples of Latin America, but it also involves actions fundamental to the defense of the West whether that defense be economic, social, political or military, against all of the forces threatening democracy.

Although it may seem that the main reason for the Alliance for Progress is to ward off the threats of communism in the Western Hemisphere, actually the origin of the basic ideas in the Alliance evolved from circumstances somewhat removed from the present communistic threat. To understand better what is taking place under the Alliance for Progress program, let us take a quick look at the highlights of its predecessors.

Prior to World War II, most cooperative hemispheric efforts were not made for the over-all economic and social benefit of the people. They were engaged in predominantly for the purpose of effecting trade and military agreements for commercial and political reasons or for dealing with problems relating to special private interests. These latter problems were generally dealt with by shows of force particularly on the part of the United States.

However, beginning with the expropriation of the properties of private oil companies in Mexico on March 18, 1938, three circumstances developed which were paramount in bringing about a change of U.S. policy toward Latin America. These circumstances were (1) the unwavering stand of the Mexican Government against all opposition to the expropriations and nationalization of the Mexican petroleum industry; (2) the desire on the part of the U.S. Government for inter-American cooperation in dealings with the world conflict now coming to a head; and (3) the activities of Nelson Rockefeller and his group in developing suggestions for inter-American economic and social improvement.

Among the largest operators in petroleum in Latin America are the Standard Oil companies in which the Rockefeller family hold substantial interests. Their operations in Argentina had been restricted for many years, their properties in Bolivia were expropriated in 1936 and as already stated in Mexico in 1938, and there was fear that their fast-developing holdings in Venezuela subsequent to 1938 could suffer the same fate.

As early as April 1937, Nelson Rockefeller, then 29 years old, made a trip to Venezuela where he observed the operations of the Creole Petroleum Corp., the Venezuelan subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. In 1939, Rockefeller went back to Venezuela. In that year, the Creole corporation hired a North American engineering firm to make a survey of the Venezuelan economy and to blueprint the bottlenecks which were stifling normal economic development of the country. The survey showed that while hundreds of millions of dollars had been pumped into the oil industry, little had been done about developing agriculture and other productive industries. Indeed, most of the food and supplies had to be imported. Wealth was concentrated in a few hands and the people were poor.

It was obvious that drastic measures were called for if the overall economy was to be developed in a manner which would benefit the entire populace instead of being concentrated principally in the hands of those exporting raw products and those importing manufactured goods. Creole management, mindful of the expropriation of oil properties in other Latin American countries was willing to do its part, but that had its limitations. Something much bigger than what could be accomplished by a single oil company or even a group of companies had to be done. This problem was one which occupied Nelson Rockefeller's intense interest for some time to come.

On return from his trip to South America in 1939, Rockefeller tried to work out terms for a settlement for the Standard Oil properties expropriated in Mexico. He arranged a meeting with President of Mexico Lázaro Cárdenas and was his house guest in Mexico. During this visit, Rockefeller apparently learned much from the man who had actually decreed the expropriations of the oil properties, and who is still Mexico's venerable liberal in political thought.

President Cárdenas told Rockefeller that the actions of foreigners in Mexico, while creating great bitterness, were not the reason for the expropriations. The real reason would not be easy for Rockefeller to understand. The Mexican President reminded Rockefeller that in the background is the seizure of Texas in 1836, the taking of New

¹ Economic geologist, and lecturer, Institute of Hispanic American and Luso-Brazilian Studies, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Mexico and California in 1846, and the sending of the Army against Villa in 1916, by the U.S. Government.

Then, he continued, one had to remember that the Mexican War of Independence ended the domination of the Spanish ruling class and restored self-confidence in Mexico's people. That was the liberation from direct colonial domination in our own country. There remained, however, the economic domination of the United States. The expropriation of the oil properties was a symbol of Mexican liberation from domination from without. Expropriation restored a sense of dignity and self-respect and independence—and, he emphasized, "That is often more important to our people than is their physical and economic well-being."

Rockefeller returned to the United States deeply impressed with the importance of the human element in international relations, something with which few businessmen had heretofore been concerned. Indeed, the record is clear that the Mexican expropriations marked the turning point for the petroleum companies in their attitudes and actions in the foreign field, and in U.S. Government policy toward Latin America.

After this memorable meeting with President Cárdenas, Nelson Rockefeller undertook to do something about improving the relationships between private enterprise and public welfare. He gathered around him a group of businessmen, bankers, lawyers, economists, and sociologists to survey, study, consult, and report on this problem. The "group" as it became known, had in it men of wide differences of thought which made it difficult to reach a common opinion on all facets of the problem but, nevertheless, they showed the way to a better understanding of it, especially as related to the peoples of Latin America.

By early 1940, the Axis powers were very active in Latin America, especially in Argentina. United States prestige began to wane while that of the Nazi-Fascists began to rise. Rockefeller and his group were convinced that the United States must protect its international position through the use of economic measures that are competitively effective against totalitarian techniques. If the United States was to maintain its security and its political and economic hemispheric position it must take measures at once to secure economic prosperity in Latin America; and to establish this prosperity in the frame of hemispheric economic cooperation and dependence. It is pertinent to note that at this time, the threat to the hemisphere was Nazi-Fascism and not communism, although the two sometimes worked hand in hand.

Rockefeller and his group had prepared a 3-page memorandum entitled "Hemispheric Economic Policy." On June 14, 1940, Nelson Rockefeller went to the White House in Washington where he read his memorandum to Harry L. Hopkins, one of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's closest advisers. The memorandum outlined a broad program that included emergency measures to absorb surplus Latin American products and measures to encourage investment in Latin America by both private interests and the Government. In addition, the memorandum stated that a vigorous program to improve cultural, scientific, and educational relations in the Americas with the cooperation of private agencies was essential.

President Roosevelt had made it known, mainly as a consequence of the Mexican expropriations, that he considered our economic relations with Latin American countries as affecting adversely our political relations with them. He was afraid this situation would delay or even preclude effective Latin American cooperation with us in the impending war. Something had to be done and Nelson Rockefeller's ideas were accepted.

From this time on, the ideas developed by Nelson Rockefeller and his group form essentially the bases for all programs adopted for economic and social development in Latin America and our policy in relation thereto. We do not have time here to develop the details of this thesis from Rockefeller's memorandum on hemispheric economic policy, in 1940, to the Alliance for Progress in 1961, but the highlights of efforts to effect a cooperative economic and social program for Latin America will unfold as we proceed.

On August 16, 1940, President Roosevelt established by Executive order, the Office for the Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, and he appointed Nelson Rockefeller the Coordinator. On July 30, 1941, this Office became the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA). The Coordinator's Office was charged with the responsibility of building up a strong mutual respect and understanding among the nations of the Americas in order that they might be better prepared to meet jointly the emergency wartime demands and plan jointly for a sound postwar structure. It expressed what is known as Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy."

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs lasted until May 20, 1946, but Rockefeller remained with it until late 1944, when on December 20, 1944, he was confirmed as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of relations with the American Republics. In this position, Rockefeller was better able to expound his ideas for improving United States-Latin American relations.

Early in 1945, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Ezequiel Padilla, proposed an Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace to deal with political and economic problems. The conference was called and met in Mexico City from February 21 through March 8, 1945. Assistant Secretary of State Nelson Rockefeller was designated alternate delegate by President Roosevelt and in this position Rockefeller played an important part in drawing up the agenda and negotiating resolutions.

As a result of this conference, 180 draft resolutions were drawn up, but the most important one relating to economic and social matters was the "Economic Charter of the Americas." In this and other resolutions a reaffirmation and extension was made of inter-American principles and aspirations which seek the general improvement and well-being of the peoples of Latin America.

On the death of President Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, Harry S. Truman became President of the United States and Nelson Rockefeller continued on as Assistant Secretary of State until August 24, 1945, when he resigned to go back to private business. However, before he resigned, Rockefeller participated actively in the Conference on International Organization in San Francisco at which the Charter of the United Nations was signed on June 26, 1945. At this Conference, Rockefeller was most active in bringing the Latin American nations into the new organization and in keeping them aligned in a cooperative bloc to support U.S.-postwar policies.

During the war period, Latin American countries had received large payments from the sale of strategic materials while they could spend comparatively little for imports of capital and consumer goods which were then in short supply. Consequently, most of these countries accumulated large amounts of gold and foreign exchange. However, following the war years, the situation was reversed. The demand and prices for raw materials fell while the countries spent heavily for imported goods which had been unavailable to them during the war. As a result, of unfavorable payments balances, it was not long before most of these countries were in financial straits and were suffering considerable social unrest.

The failure of the U.S. Government to take effective action in efforts to ameliorate these adverse conditions in Latin America after the war prompted Rockefeller to consider what might be done by private capital to bolster Latin American economies and thus strengthen inter-American political and cultural ties. It was a matter of record that in the last century capital went where it could make the greatest profit. Now it was apparent in the defense of capitalism that it must go where it can render the greatest service to the general welfare, especially in Latin America.

In order to implement his ideas, Nelson Rockefeller, in conjunction with his four brothers, set up in 1946, a private philanthropic organization called the American International Association for Economic and Social Development (AIA). Shortly thereafter, they established the International Basic Economy Corp., a private company to conduct business mainly in Latin America. The reasons for establishing these privately-owned organizations were stated by Rockefeller to be that the hope for future peace and security in the world depends on closer relations and better understanding among the peoples of the world, coupled with a rising standard of living and a steady improvement of conditions.

The earliest attempt to formalize Rockefeller's basic ideas into inter-American action are expressed in the "Economic Agreement of Bogotá," an instrument fundamentally not much unlike the present Charter of Punta del Este. This agreement was signed by representatives of all the member nations of the Organization of American States on May 2, 1948, meeting in Bogotá, Colombia. In this document it is stated that the purposes of the cooperation and principles which inspire it are those set forth in the Economic Charter of the Americas (March 8, 1945), the Charter of the United Nations (June 26, 1945), and the Organization of American States (May 2, 1948) thus linking the present effort with its predecessors.

Rockefeller's endeavors did not stop here. He realized that private efforts alone could effect only a small part of the necessary objectives. He now proposed what soon became known as the point IV program. When material was being prepared for President-elect Harry Truman's inaugural address in January 1949, Rockefeller's idea got into the speech as Truman's point 4 program for technical assistance. On November 24, 1950, President Truman wrote to Nelson Rockefeller that "• • • any adequate and sound program for international economic development must • • • lend itself to realistic and continuing cooperation between private enterprise and government, here and abroad." In the same month, President Truman appointed Rockefeller chairman of the International Development Advisory Board to recommend policy in connection with the execution of the point IV program.

In 1952, Rockefeller resigned as chairman of the International Development Advisory Board and returned to New York City. However, early in 1953, President Eisenhower appointed Rockefeller chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization; later he became Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By December 1954, he resigned this position whence President Eisenhower asked him to become Special Assistant to the President on Foreign Affairs. Here his position was basically to assess the psychological aspects of U.S. foreign policy. Rockefeller not only believed in maintaining an adequate defense but also was convinced that money spent wisely on foreign economic cooperation would save the taxpayers huge sums of money in the future.

In December 1955 Rockefeller told President Eisenhower that personal affairs made it necessary that he resign as special assistant to the President. He returned to New

York in 1956. One of his ideas now was to make a private study of major problems that would confront the people of the United States in the next 10 or 20 years. He suggested to his brothers that they finance a special studies project under the title of America at Mid-Century. They agreed to do so through the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, a philanthropic organization they had set up in 1940 to make contributions to charities, civic organizations, educational and research endeavors.

In 1958 that part of the study dealing with the Western Hemisphere was published, and it is in this part of the report that the precepts for what became the Alliance for Progress are reiterated and amplified.

After the termination of the Korean war in July 1953, the period 1954-58 became one of almost dire neglect of our good neighbors in Latin America. The economies of most of the countries were becoming progressively worse, their governments unstable, and the populace increasingly restive. Latin leaders complained that the United States had not given them sufficient aid to ward off increasing attacks from leftist agitators. They complained that we had directed the bulk of our aid to Europe and Asia while they had received comparatively little.

Indeed, this contention was true. Of the world total obligations and loan authorizations by the U.S. Government for economic assistance for the period from fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1959, Latin America had received less than 7 percent; of the total military assistance slightly more than 1 percent; and for all assistance combined, a little more than 5 percent.

Something had to be done. Various emissaries were sent on trips to Latin America to ascertain the facts, to give assurance of aid, and spread good will. Among them were the President's brother Milton Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, and a number of Members of Congress. Although cognizant of the situation, apparently our Government did not realize its seriousness until Vice President Richard Nixon, while on a good will trip throughout South America was booed, pelted with various objects and otherwise ill-treated in some of the more distressed areas.

Indeed, it remained for President Kubitschek of Brazil to call attention to the seriousness of the situation. After Vice President Nixon's trip President Kubitschek on May 28, 1958 wrote a letter to President Eisenhower in which he said:

"I want to convey to Your Excellency, on behalf of the Brazilian people as well as for myself, an expression of sentiments of solidarity and esteem, the affirmation of which is necessary in view of the aggression and vexations undergone by Vice President Nixon during his recent visit to countries in Latin America.

"It is hoped that the unpleasant memory of the ordeal undergone by Vice President Nixon will be effaced by the results of earnest efforts toward creating something deeper and more durable for the defense and preservation of our common destiny."

In reply, President Eisenhower wrote to President Kubitschek on June 5:

"To my mind you have described accurately both the existing situation and the desirability of corrective action. I am delighted, therefore, that you have taken the initiative in this matter."

By August 1958 President Eisenhower had sent a group headed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to Brazil to exchange views on how to promote the hemispheric solidarity of the 21 American Republics. On August 6, a joint communiqué was issued at Brasilia at the conclusion of talks between President Kubitschek and U.S. Secretary of State Dulles. The communiqué dealt with an exchange of views on the international situation but more specifically with those problems relating to the movement for hemispheric unity which President Kubitschek called "Operation Pan America" previously referred to.

Operation Pan America called for directing efforts toward increasing the average per capita income of Latin America from less than \$300 per year to \$500 per year by 1980. Brazilian planners spoke of a decade of dollar loans averaging \$600 million annually. At first this proposal was considered fantastic and was not taken too seriously but as the communistic color of Cuba developed more intensely after 1959, Operation Pan America began to seem realistic.

After a number of meetings and discussions, the Council of the Organization of American States, on July 1, 1960, set September 5 as the date and Bogotá, Colombia, as the place for a meeting. By this time, Cuba was definitely in the Communist camp and was spreading its doctrine and gaining wide support among many of the left-wing groups in the economically depressed countries of Latin America.

On the afternoon of September 13, 1960, in a ceremonial session, final approval was given to a document called the Act of Bogotá. The vote was 19 for, with 1 against. The sole dissent came from Cuba; while the Dominican Republic was not present.

As finally approved, the Act of Bogotá is longer and more detailed than the original U.S. draft, but it is consistent with the spirit and objectives of the first draft and embodies essentially all of the provisions for economic and social development originally promulgated by Nelson Rockefeller's efforts as heretofore set forth.

Thus, the measure for social improvement and economic development within the framework of Operation Pan America were established. It remained now for the Organization of American States to formalize these measures into a charter which would bind the signatory member-nations in a common effort to bring their people accelerated economic progress and broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty.

The Eisenhower administration at the instigation of and in collaboration with President Kubitschek of Brazil had laid the foundations for the economic and social development program in Latin America which was later to result in President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. By now the Eisenhower administration was coming to an end and that of President Kennedy about to begin.

The Alliance for Progress was first used as a phrase by President Kennedy in his inaugural address in January 1961. On March 13, 1961, at a White House dinner for Latin American diplomats, selected Members of Congress and others, President Kennedy outlined his ideas for the program and said:

"If we are to meet a problem so staggering in its dimensions, our approach must itself be equally bold, an approach consistent with the majestic concept of Operation Pan America. Therefore I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress—a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work, land, health, and schools."

On May 26, 1961, President Kennedy sent letters to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate relating to a plan for reorganization of the mutual security program. Meanwhile, on May 27, an authorized \$600 million fund for the Inter-American social and economic program had been appropriated by the Congress. On June 2, it was announced that the responsibility and authority for the formulation and execution of the foreign development aid programs would be assigned to a single new Agency for International Development within the Department of State. ICA was abolished by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and functions redelegated to Agency for

International Development pursuant to President Kennedy's letter of September 30, 1961, and Executive order of November 3, 1961.

On June 19, 1961, with the funds originally requested by President Eisenhower now appropriated, a Social Progress Trust Fund Agreement was made by and between the U.S. Government and the Inter-American Development Bank to administer \$394 million of the \$500 million in the Special Inter-American Fund for Social Progress. Of the balance, \$100 million went to the Agency for International Development and \$6 million to the Organization of American States; while the \$100 million additional went into the Chilean reconstruction program.

On August 5, 1961, at the ministerial level under the auspices of the OAS the special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (IA-ECOSOC) convened at Punta del Este, Uruguay, for the purpose of formulating the Alliance for Progress. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon headed the U.S. delegation while Senators WAYNE MORSE and BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER attended as observers.

By August 17, 1961, the special meeting of the IA-ECOSOC at Punta del Este, was concluded with the signing of the basic documents for the Alliance for Progress by 20 member nations of the OAS including the Dominican Republic which was now again in the good graces of the Organization but not by Cuba which did not choose to sign. These documents were: (1) A declaration to the peoples of America; and (2) the Charter of Punta del Este, establishing an Alliance for progress within the framework of Operation Pan America.

In addition, there were signed 16 resolutions pertaining to economic and social development, economic integration, basic export commodities, an annual review of economic and social progress and social meetings of the IA-ECOSOC at the ministerial level, and public opinion and the Alliance for Progress.

Broadly, the Alliance for Progress is a phrase which describes all of the economic and social programs through which the signers of the Charter of Punta del Este undertake on a government-to-government or government-to-private people basis in the Latin American area. Departments, agencies, offices, and organizations too numerous to set forth here, function within the program in one way or another. It is a vast setup which took AID administrators themselves some time to find out what they were doing and where they were going. Indeed, it is so vast and complicated in organization and administration that it is practically impossible to prepare a complete functional chart of the inter- and intra-workings showing all of the ramifications of the entire business.

Just where the central office of administration and implementation of the overall Alliance for Progress program lies is somewhat obscure. Much of the activity, and certainly that of the United States, is centered in the State Department's Agency for International Development where an Assistant Administrator of its Latin American Bureau functions as Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress through a number of committees of which probably the most generic is the Alliance for Progress Committee.

The precise amount of money required for implementation of the Alliance for Progress program is not spelled out in the Charter of Punta del Este. In that document, it is written "that the supply of capital from all external sources during the coming 10 years of at least \$20 million be made available to the Latin American countries, and the greater part of this sum should be in public funds."

At the meeting at Punta del Este, it was contemplated that the United States would

endeavor to make available to the countries in the form of loans, credits, or grants about one-tenth of the total amount that Alliance program required to be invested in Latin America over a 10-year period. The United States would, subject to certain reform measures by the Latin American countries, help them get an additional 10th from other public sources while the countries themselves would be responsible for supplying the remaining 80 percent of the funds, either by increasing their taxes and collections, selling their securities, inducing savings and investment by their own people, and attracting investment from abroad. In other words, they were talking about an investment of \$100 billion over a period of 10 years, 80 percent of which would come from the Latin American Republics themselves.

In light of the total U.S. direct capital investments in all of Latin America (including European dependencies) over the years to the end of 1961 of only slightly more than \$10 billion, the figure of \$100 billion for the next 10 years seems rather large. Yet this is the goal.

As for immediate and short-term emergency financing, the United States agreed to provide more than \$1 billion in the year ending March 1962. A total of \$1,030 million was committed to Latin American countries during this first year of operations ending February 28, 1962, but it is estimated that only about one-quarter of this sum was actually disbursed up to that time.

Alliance for Progress funds furnished by the U.S. Government are administered by a number of Government agencies of which the most important are the Agency for International Development (AID), the Export-Import Bank of Washington (Eximbank), the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and Food for Peace under Public Law 480. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, obligations and loans authorized (but not necessarily disbursed) totaled slightly more than \$1,117 million in economic assistance. Of this total, AID administered \$453 million or 41 percent; Eximbank \$262 million or 24 percent; Social Progress Trust Fund \$224 million or 20 percent; Food for Peace \$147 million or 13 percent; and other unspecified agencies \$30 million or less than 3 percent.

Recipients of most of these obligations and loan authorizations were Chile with \$211 million or 20 percent of the total; Brazil with \$202 million or 18 percent; Mexico with \$150 million or 14 percent; Argentina with \$79 million or 7 percent; and Peru, Venezuela, and Colombia \$70-odd million or with about 7 percent each. These six countries combined received nearly \$872 million or more than 78 percent of the total.

These figures in themselves may be impressive until one determines how and where the money was or is to be spent, and above all, whether much of it or any of it went or would go to the underprivileged classes causing most of our troubles and whose welfare is supposed to be the objective of our efforts. Actually very little of the funds obligated and authorized have been disbursed and of the total committed during the first year of operations ending February 28, 1962, nearly 60 percent went for such nonproductive categories as refinancing of purchases, balancing of payments, budget support, reconstruction and relief, industrial credit and capital goods financing, and national companies and banks; and little of the remaining 40 percent went directly into productive enterprise in which the masses of the populace could participate.

Funds to be administered by the various above-named agencies are first authorized and then appropriated by the Congress of the United States after due justification for them as advocated mostly by the officials of the agencies concerned. The origin and channeling of the appropriated funds into the several disbursing agencies is often in-

volved but in the last analysis they are derived from the taxpayer. Thus, the taxpayers and the Congressmen who represent them have a tangible interest in seeing that these funds will accomplish the objectives for which they are solicited.

In their attempts to justify the appropriations, the administrators of these agencies argue that expenditure of them is not only straightening things out in Latin America but is of great benefit to our economy. They point out that between 80 and 85 percent of the money granted or loaned in Latin America never leaves this country but is spent here for machinery, equipment, supplies, and services which increase production and employment in, and exports from, the United States. But Representative Otto F. Passman, of Louisiana, chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, contends correctly that if the money so spent is derived from grants and long-term non-interest-bearing loans which probably never will be repaid, then the U.S. taxpayer is in reality picking up the tab for these goods and services.

Insofar as the Alliance for Progress funds are supplied by the U.S. taxpayer to enable Latin American governments to pay for purchases in this country, these governments can utilize their own foreign exchange derived from their exports either to purchase other goods elsewhere, accumulate foreign exchange, buy gold from us, or otherwise utilize money which in effect U.S. taxpayers give them.

If these contentions are true, and certainly insofar as they are true, our financial situation is frightening in light of the manner in which our foreign assistance program is functioning, especially under the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America. During the year 1961, while our gold supply decreased \$857 million, that of Latin America increased by \$55 million; and during the year 1962 while our gold supply decreased \$304 million, that of Latin America decreased only \$25 million. During fiscal year 1962, our Government committed more than \$1,000 million in aid to Latin America of which more than \$300 million was actually disbursed.

On the other hand, even if these facts are admitted, there is the defense-policy philosophy which considers that our so-called foreign assistance program is in reality economic warfare the cost of which should be borne by the taxpayer as unhesitatingly as he bears the cost of military warfare. Whatever the viewpoint or actual cost, foreign assistance or economic warfare, whichever one prefers to call it, is with us to stay at least until this world becomes one glorious federation of peaceful peoples—and that most likely is for a long time.

The charter of Punta del Este establishing an Alliance for Progress is complete with noble aims and objectives, but as the Honorable Otto F. Passman said in hearings before his subcommittee on appropriations, "We all have the same objectives. But saying it and doing it are two different things." That means that the benefits from the money spent under the program must reach the people who are disgruntled and are causing our trouble. In order to accomplish this objective we must build up productive programs in agriculture, processing, manufacturing, and distribution in which the people can participate, earn money, purchase domestic commodities, save and invest, and vitalize their own economies. Of course, these necessities are understood by those administering the Alliance program but certainly so far, they have not directed funds into channels leading to that end.

Most of the agitation against the United States in Latin America comes from student, labor, and peasant leaders who represent the great masses of the underprivileged. The record is clear that what we desire from the masses has not been attained over the past

16 years with money per se, threats, or force. As Nelson Rockefeller realized after his first visit into Latin America more than 25 years ago, our problem is not alone an economic one but fundamentally one of human relations.

What we should have done years ago and what we must do now without further delay is to get to the people. If we must spend the taxpayers' money, let us spend it where the results of that spending will get at the roots of our trouble; and to accomplish this basic objective, the following priority program of essentials is urged:

1. Review educational and labor systems; develop and coordinate them with the democratic, economic, social, and political planning of each country.

2. Enlist students, teachers, industrial and farmworkers in popular programs geared to their economic and social welfare.

3. Set up efficient student, teacher, labor and farmer training programs; interchange leaders for purposes of mutual understanding and appreciation in efforts to achieve democratic ends.

4. Assure every student, teacher, and worker a job commensurate with his or her training and ability; make a sense of participation, human dignity, and social security the prime incentives and rewards of the common effort.

5. Encourage and assist free enterprise in establishing privately owned and operated productive agricultural, processing, manufacturing, and distribution activities in which the people can function as both producers and consumers to create and sustain a viable domestic economy.

6. Direct the bulk of assistance funds into education, health and sanitation facilities, housing, and public welfare activities; do not expend such funds on public utilities, transportation facilities, heavy industry, and other "infrastructure" facilities except when and where absolutely necessary and feasible.

7. Eliminate entirely the expenditure of foreign assistance funds on such purely fiscal matters as balancing budgets, paying off trade deficits, lending to nationalized institutions, and the like.

It is evident that the administration of our foreign assistance programs over the years has been so disunified, complex, cumbersome, and misdirected that the objectives sought have not been attained. In particular, the Alliance for Progress program is so diversified in its aims, nebulous in its structure, and bureaucratic in its organization that it is practically unworkable.

It is also self-evident that no matter what we do on our side of the picture to encourage and protect private business in entering the Latin American field, if the investment atmosphere within the Latin American countries themselves is not favorable, our efforts to enlist the aid of private enterprise will be of little or no avail.

Furthermore, expropriations of privately owned public utilities and certain natural-resource and heavy industries are bound to continue in Latin American countries under the wave of nationalism which has swept most of them since the last World War.

In order to eliminate the organizational and administrative handicaps and to better the implementation of our foreign assistance programs for the preservation and protection of democratic ideals in the Americas, it is proposed:

I. That the U.S. Government create a Department of Foreign Economic and Social Operations in which to centralize, unify, control, coordinate, and direct all of our foreign economic, social, and technical assistance programs.

II. That the Organization of American States effect an Inter-American Treaty for Uniform Investment and Antimonopoly Laws designed to prevent the flight of private capital from Latin American countries, and to attract private capital into these countries.

III. That within the framework of the proposed Treaty for Uniform Investment and Antimonopoly Laws, there be set up an inter-American permanent expropriation review and settlement board designed to take the sting and stigma out of Government condemnations of private property.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—PART I

Alliance for Progress—the current program of the U.S. aid to Latin American nations—was initiated by Eisenhower; but it has become the major feature of President Kennedy's foreign policy.

The President claims that Alliance for Progress is intended to save Latin America from communism. Actually, the program is using American tax money to finance, and force upon Latin American countries, a communist-socialist revolution.

Kennedy has never given any precise estimate of what he expects to spend on Alliance for Progress; but general estimates are that the program will cost U.S. taxpayers \$20 billion in the first 10 years.¹

ORIGINS

The origins of the Alliance for Progress program are almost as unsavory as its consequences.

On July 13, 1960, Fernando Berckemeyer (Peruvian Ambassador to the United States) and Roy R. Rubottom, Jr. (then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs) discussed in Washington a suggestion by the Peruvian Government that foreign ministers of all 21 American republics meet to discuss the Soviet threat in the Americas.

A committee composed of representatives from seven Central and South American nations went to work on the Peruvian suggestion. The committee's biggest job was deciding upon an agenda and a meeting place that would be acceptable to Castro of Cuba. On July 26, 1960, the committee announced it had solved this major problem: the foreign ministers' conference of the Organization of American States could meet at San Jose, Costa Rica; and it would consider as its first order of business, not Communist control of Cuba or Communist infiltration of Latin America, but charges against Gen. Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. The Government of Venezuela had accused Trujillo of plotting to assassinate Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela.

On August 16, 1960, foreign ministers representing 21 American nations, began their conference at San Jose.

Christian Herter, Eisenhower's Secretary of State, took the lead in getting the Organization of American States to take action against the Dominican Republic.

On August 20, 1960, the Conference adopted a formal resolution recommending that all other American nations break diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and impose severe economic sanctions against her.

On August 22, 1960, Christian Herter initiated the second stage of the OAS meeting at San Jose, Costa Rica, by presenting a U.S. bill of particulars against Cuba.

On August 23, 1960, Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala (Colombian foreign minister) answered Herter's charges against Castro. Turbay reaffirmed his faith in the principles of Castro's revolution and denied that Castro was actually a Communist. Turbay reviewed, with interest, Castro's charges against the United States—and deplored the U.S. sugar restrictions against Cuba (that is, our cutting off the sugar subsidy).

On August 29, 1960, the foreign ministers proclaimed the Declaration of San Jose, written by Turbay of Colombia, in which the members of the Organization of American

States pledged themselves to democratic principles; to the rejection of totalitarian regimes of the right or left; to nonintervention in each others' affairs; and to support of the Organization of American States. The declaration did not even mention Cuba.

Thus the San Jose Conference of the Organization of American States—originally proposed by Peru for the purpose of discussing the Soviet threat in Cuba—achieved the destruction of Trujillo, America's only strong anti-Communist friend in the Caribbean area; but did not even scold Castro.

Christian Herter came home from San Jose, boasting that the United States had achieved a great diplomatic triumph.

The first stage of the OAS Conference of 1960 was completed at San Jose on August 20, when the delegates voted to isolate Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. The second stage was completed on August 29, when the Declaration of San Jose was adopted.

The third stage of the conference was conducted not at San Jose, Costa Rica, but at Bogotá, Colombia. The third stage, beginning on September 6, 1960, was a meeting of the economic ministers of the American Republics. This Bogotá stage of the OAS Conference was, simply, our State Department's payoff to the Central and South American Republics for what they had done at San Jose.

Douglas Dillon (then Eisenhower's Under Secretary of State) went to the Bogotá Conference with an Eisenhower promise of \$500 million of American tax money to be given Latin American nations.

Dillon began his speech to the conference by paying tribute to the role which Turbay of Colombia had played at the San Jose Conference. Remember, Turbay wrote the Declaration of San Jose, which turned out to be a victory for international communism. Turbay had praised the principles of Castro's revolution; he had viewed, with interest, Castro's charges against the United States; and he had denounced the U.S. sugar restrictions against Castro.

Before Dillon went to Bogotá, the whole world knew that Eisenhower was sending him with a promise of \$500 million in aid to Latin America. But there had been grumbling throughout Latin America that this was not enough. Castro was demanding that the United States inaugurate a \$30 billion aid program to Latin America. Brazil, and most other Latin American nations, were supporting the general tenor of Castro's demands, though the figures they named were somewhat less extravagant.

It looked as if our Latin American friends might not graciously accept Eisenhower's offer of \$500 million.

Douglas Dillon was prepared. He made it clear that the \$500 million which he had come to offer was a mere drop in the bucket—just a beginning. All of this was to be used only for social development. He promised bigger and more respectable U.S. aid to all of Latin America to continue economic development in that region.

"Social development," apparently, means schools, housing, hospitals—that sort of thing—to be built with money taken away from U.S. taxpayers. "Economic development" seems to mean the continuation of building, with U.S. tax money, roads, harbors, industrial plants (to compete with our own, of course), public buildings, and so on.

Douglas Dillon won another smashing diplomatic victory for the United States at Bogotá: the Latin American Republics agreed to accept our offer of \$500 million for social development and our promise of billions for economic development.

On September 13, 1960, the economic ministers of the American Republics signed the act of Bogotá, authorizing a massive program of U.S. aid to Latin American countries.

In his first inaugural address (January 20, 1961) President Kennedy gave this new aid-

to-Latin-America program its current name: Alliance for Progress. President Kennedy said:

"To our sister Republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new Alliance for Progress—to assist freemen and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty."

REVOLUTIONARY PURPOSE

On March 13, 1961, speaking to Latin American diplomats, and Members of the U.S. Congress, President Kennedy said:

"I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress. I have this evening signed a request to the Congress for \$500 million as a first step in fulfilling the act of Bogotá. This is the first large-scale inter-American effort—Instituted by my predecessor, President Eisenhower—to attack the social barriers which block economic progress.

"This political freedom must be accompanied by social change. For unless necessary social reforms, including land and tax reforms, are freely made * * * then our alliance, our revolution, our dream, and our freedom will fail."²

In his formal message to Congress (March 14, 1961) asking for the \$500 million to initiate the Alliance for Progress (as authorized by the act of Bogotá) President Kennedy again stressed the revolutionary purpose of this program. Acknowledging that revolutionary new social institutions and patterns cannot be designed overnight, President Kennedy implied that we must nonetheless begin at once a crash program to overturn the existing way of life in Latin America—giving our aid not on the basis of need, but on the demonstrated readiness of each government to make the institutional improvements which we require.

This theme of total revolution in Latin America, financed and enforced by U.S. tax money under the label of "Alliance for Progress," was reemphasized at a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (held at Punta del Este, Uruguay) on August 16, 1961. In the formal declaration issued by the delegates at this meeting, the Latin American nations receiving American aid pledged themselves.

"To encourage * * * programs of integral agrarian reform.

"To assure to workers fair wages and satisfactory working conditions.

"To establish effective systems of labor-management relations and procedures.

"To reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have most, punishing tax evasion severely, and redistributing the national income."³

THE REVOLUTIONISTS

On November 6, 1961, President Kennedy announced appointment of Teodoro Moscoso as regional administrator for Latin America in the new Agency for International Development—that is, as head of the Alliance for Progress program. Moscoso is a Puerto Rican socialist, an early protege of Rexford Guy Tugwell, the braintrustor whom Franklin D. Roosevelt made Governor of Puerto Rico. Moscoso is also an intimate friend of Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela, who is a Communist.

To understand the grim truth—that Alliance for Progress is a crash program with American tax money to tear Latin America apart and then reorganize it according to the Communist plan for a Marxist land—one needs a little background information

¹ "President Kennedy Speaks on the Alliance for Progress," a booklet published recently by the Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

² Department of State Publication No. 572, Aug. 16, 1961.

on some of the principal actors in this revolutionary drama. At present, two of the principals are Teodoro Moscoso, Kennedy's Chief of the Alliance for Progress program; and Romulo Betancourt, Communist President of Venezuela.

Former U.S. Representative John Rousset, Republican, of California did a great deal of research on Betancourt, and put the results of his labors into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: volume 107, part 16, pages 20941-20946; volume 108, part 3, pages 2951-2956; volume 108, part 10, pages 18185-18191.

U.S. Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 17, pages 23552-23553; and February 7, 1963 (pp. 1978-1980), more revealing information about Betancourt.

Here, in brief, is the Betancourt story:

As a young man, Betancourt worked openly as a functionary of the Communist international in Venezuela. For this Communist activity, he was exiled from his homeland in 1928. During exile, Betancourt went to Costa Rica where, with Manuel Mora, he founded the Communist Party of Costa Rica and was, for 5 years (1930 to 1935) head of that party. Working openly for a Communist revolution throughout Latin America, Betancourt discovered that communism could not thus be sold to the people. It would have to be imposed upon them by deception. Betancourt devised a hoax. He would renounce his membership in the Communist Party and return to Venezuela as an anti-Communist, and work to impose communism on his homeland by calling his program anti-Communist.

He did return to Venezuela, gathered his old Communist cronies around him, and launched his new Communist program of deception. He had made the mistake, however, of explaining his scheme in letters to Communist friends. These letters fell into the hands of Venezuelan authorities; and Betancourt was again ordered into exile. He evaded this banishment and went underground. For 9 years he remained in hiding. During that time, he organized a powerful Communist front disguised as a political party, which he called Accion Democratica (Democratic Action).

In 1945, a military junta overthrew the legal Government of Venezuela, and turned to Betancourt for leadership. Betancourt became president of the junta. Using the established political machinery of Accion Democratica, and appointing Communist henchmen to key posts in government, Betancourt ruled Venezuela for 3 years.

His rule was so corrupt and tyrannical that, on November 24, 1948, an uprising of military officers, led by Marcos Perez Jimenez, overthrew Betancourt and his stooges; and Betancourt again went into exile.

For over 9 years, Betancourt remained in exile. He spent much of that time in New York City, where he became the darling of the ultraliberal, anti-anti-Communist crowd of Socialist intellectuals—a hero to the leading liberals of the Eisenhower, and later of the Kennedy, administration.

In 1956, Betancourt's Communist connections became so objectionable that he was arrested in New York City (on information supplied by the FBI), was expelled from the United States, and denied readmittance. He was, however, permitted to live in Puerto Rico. Here, he became an intimate of Munoz-Marin, Socialist Governor of Puerto Rico, and of Teodoro Moscoso.⁴

Leftist groups in Venezuela (widely believed to have been directed and encouraged by Betancourt's new friends in the American State Department) overthrew Marcos Perez Jimenez in January 1958. About June

1958, Betancourt returned to Venezuela, revived his Accion Democratica, and ran for President. Again with the undercover support of the American State Department (which included widely circulated rumors, in Venezuela, that if Betancourt's party won the election, Venezuela would receive mammoth amounts of aid from the United States), Betancourt was elected.

Jimenez (who had given Venezuela the best government and had brought the nation to the highest level of prosperity in its history) was exiled. He sought asylum in the United States. Betancourt wants him returned to Venezuela so that he can be executed. He has filed outrageous charges against Jimenez, who is now in a Miami jail awaiting extradition. The American State Department and the powerful left-wing propaganda forces in the United States (including, for example, such "respected" organs as the *Christian Science Monitor*) have for months been conducting a massive hate campaign against Jimenez, preparing public opinion for denying him asylum so that he can be turned over to Betancourt for liquidation.

In 1961, the law firm of Dean Acheson (who is a special adviser to President Kennedy) received \$180,000 from Betancourt's government as a fee for representing Venezuela in the extradition proceedings against Jimenez.⁵

ALLIANCE SHOWPIECE

Meanwhile, Betancourt's regime in Venezuela has become a cesspool of corruption and tyranny. Despite Venezuela's enormous natural riches (and despite the hundreds of millions of dollars which Betancourt has obtained from the United States), grinding poverty, economic chaos, and wild disorder reign in Venezuela.

The reported Communist sabotage in Venezuela, and Betancourt's alleged crackdown on Communists, are merely part of a hoax—to justify Betancourt's seizure of absolute power, and to help the Kennedy administration justify more aid.

Communist Betancourt's Venezuela is the land which the Kennedy administration points to as the showpiece of the Alliance for Progress.⁶

Shortly after Kennedy was inaugurated, in January 1961, he appointed Teodoro Moscoso (Betancourt's old friend) to be Ambassador to Venezuela. In November 1961, Kennedy promoted Moscoso to the post of Chief of the Alliance for Progress. In December 1961, when it became apparent that Betancourt, despite his support from Washington, was in deep trouble in Venezuela, President and Mrs. Kennedy made a hastily planned visit to him, to help shore up his sagging regime. Here is an account of this disgraceful episode in American history, in the words of U.S. Representative John Rousset (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 2951):

"President Kennedy's trip to Venezuela was what was needed to bolster Betancourt's sinking Accion Democratica government. To the eternal humiliation of the American people, President Kennedy permitted himself to be used in this desperate Betancourt personal political maneuver. He permitted himself to be paraded through the streets of Caracas to impress upon the discontented Venezuelan populace that the United States is backing Betancourt. Before he departed, he was persuaded to deliver a series of speeches, obviously prepared for him by his collectivist aides, hailing the alleged progress of Venezuela under Betancourt and pledging generous American loans."

Mr. Rousset's words do not adequately portray the shameful behavior of the Amer-

ican President while visiting Communist Betancourt.

President and Mrs. Kennedy arrived in Venezuela on December 16, 1961. In his welcoming speech, Betancourt (while praising Kennedy personally) insulted the United States with open arrogance. Betancourt praised Kennedy as a "U.S. President who is rectifying a long period of ignorance and lack of comprehension (in the United States)." Betancourt denounced the "arrogant belief (in the United States) that the friendship *** (of Latin America) was guaranteed to the United States by the self-appointed rulers and their courts of small oligarchies." Betancourt criticized the "bad habits of bureaucratic routine" in the United States, which had slowed down the flow of U.S. aid to Latin America, and demanded speed in satisfying the economic, social and cultural underdevelopment of Latin America.

President Kennedy answered these insults to the United States by saying:

"Your distinguished President Romulo Betancourt, is demonstrating the capacity of freemen to realize their aspirations without sacrificing liberty or dignity.

"He has reestablished democratic government after a decade of dictatorship—and he has carried forward a solid and responsible program of economic progress.

"I come (to Venezuela) to take counsel with your leaders *** to witness the magnificent example of vital democracy which is being carried forward in Venezuela."

In another speech at LaMorita, on December 17, President Kennedy said:

"Here in Venezuela the meaning of the new Alianza para el Progreso is being demonstrated, for you have made a tradition and transition from depressive dictatorship into a free life for the people of this country to progressive democratic rule under the grant of the great democratic statesman of the Western Hemisphere—your distinguished President Romulo Betancourt.

"Today 86 families will receive their titles to their own homes under a program which has already settled 38,000 families on 3,800,000 acres of land.

"This is your program—the program of your progressive far-seeing Government—and the people of my country will share in this program by making available more loans to build rural homes and more credits to finance your crops.

"This program is at the heart of the Alianza para el Progreso."⁶

AGRARIAN REFORMS

It is rumored in Venezuela that farmers who want to get a piece of land under Betancourt's "agrarian reform" must kick back 10 percent of the value to Betancourt's political party (Acción Democratica). But even if we ignore the graft (at our expense) what do we find, on close examination, in the agrarian reform which President Kennedy praises extravagantly, and which he says is the heart of our Alliance for Progress program for all of Latin America? Here is what U.S. Representative Rousset found:

"The United States is the greatest example that could be cited of a nation which has enriched itself through a constructive agrarian program. Our program was inaugurated with the Homestead Act after the Civil War.

"Through this act, vast stretches of rich virgin land in the West were brought into cultivation. The act did not propose to take over the productive farms already in operation in New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, and cut them up into small uneconomic holdings. Instead, it directed the new farmers to uncultivated land or the frontier, which increased rather than decreased the Nation's crop production.

"Does Betancourt propose to do this in Venezuela with the aid of the agrarian reform

⁴ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 1963, pp. 1978-1980, remarks of WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

⁵ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 17, pp. 23552-23553, remarks of WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

⁶ The New York Times, Dec. 17, 1961, p. 37.

millions which President Kennedy promised him? No indeed. Venezuela has enormous stretches of uncultivated and good government-owned land in the Provinces of Sucre, Monaga, Anzoategui, and Bolivar. They are served by convenient transportation facilities. For the more distant future, it has the empire sweep of the vast area beyond the Orinoco.

"Did Betancourt propose an agrarian plan, like that of the United States, which would open up this abundant government-owned land through an orderly, wealth-producing program? He did not. Instead, he launched a program to buy up land already in successful cultivation and cut it up into small, uneconomic plots. These plots were mostly near Caracas where they could be used as showcase exhibits for credulous visitors. President Kennedy was taken to one of these cut-up farms and induced to make a speech enthusiastically hailing the Betancourt land program, and promising far-reaching aid."⁷

The agrarian and other social reforms which our socialist planners are devising, and financing with our money, throughout Latin America, have sinister aspects.

A Mexican businessman, deeply disturbed about our Alliance for Progress program, sent me the following account of what is happening:

"In many Latin American countries the vast majority of the land areas taken away from the large landowners is reportedly divided up among peons or poor rural peasants. This sounds lovely to the people who read it and especially attractive to the American people who through their Government and Government banks finance with loans and grants these so-called agrarian reforms which appear to give the land to the peasants.

"However almost the exact reverse is the case. Most of the land taken away from the large landowners is not given to the peons or peasants, but the ownership is kept by the governments and only assigned year by year to the peons. Thereby the former landowner is replaced by a much bigger landowner whose local representative is a political appointee who is able to assign a small piece of land each year to each peon or refuse it to him or change him to another piece as he (the political appointee) sees fit.

"The result is, in practice, that the peon has lost his old patron, who in many cases was a humane sort of person, and generally lived on the property at least a part of the year, and whose ear could be reached by the peon, as those who have lived in Latin America in the past can testify. In exchange he has a new patron who is a 'faceless, cold, impersonal' government office represented by a frequently changing political appointee who has no direct interest in the productivity of the soil and frequently is principally interested in enriching himself while he holds on to his insecure job.

"The peon does not own any land, he has no feeling of ownership, does not know how long he may be permitted to work the same plot and hence can have no interest in improving the land, and does feel totally dependent on the whim of the politicians, which is just what the Communists desire and in this way attain. All the land belongs to the government.

"The same is true of most of the government housing schemes. The houses are not sold to the people but are rented to them. All the houses belong to the government and this added to the government control of transportation, telegraphs, movies and the press, is perfect preparation for the establishment of the totalitarian state or communism. Government intervention is

creeping forward all the time, and the money which the Alliance for Progress gives to these leftist governments only speeds up the march down to socialism and eventually communism.

"American citizens should give as much importance to stopping the socialistic policies of the Alliance for Progress as they do to impeding socialistic legislation in their own country. U.S. taxpayers have already spent many hundreds of millions of dollars on the Alliance for Progress, in promoting policies which are absolutely against the best interests of the Latin American countries concerned, against their economic and political freedom, and against the best interests of the United States into the bargain."

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941 he joined the faculty at Harvard as a teaching fellow in English doing graduate work for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the field of American civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He worked as an FBI agent in all parts of the Nation handling all kinds of assignments. But for 3½ years, he worked exclusively on Communist investigations in the industrial Midwest. For 2 years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After 9½ years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost 4 years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July 1955 he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side—the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to the Dan Smoot Report.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 25, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—PART II

In 1950, an American dollar was worth 18.3 Brazilian cruzeiros. By January, 1962 (despite inflation of U.S. currency), the dollar would buy 350 cruzeiros.

In January 1963 (shortly after the United States had granted Brazil another special loan of \$30 million to help stabilize the currency), I visited Brazil. The night I arrived, an American dollar would buy 600 cruzeiros. My guide advised me not to exchange any money that night, however, because, he said, I would probably get a better rate of exchange the next day. I did. The next morning, I bought 650 cruzeiros for 1 American dollar. When I left Brazil 8 days later, the rate was fluctuating between 750 and 800 cruzeiros to 1 American dollar.

During my stay in Brazil, I interviewed numerous people (middle-class Brazilians, resident Americans, an official of the U.S. Information Agency, and so on.) All of them cited the building of Brasilia as the primary reason for the inflation.

GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE

Brasilia is the new capital of Brazil, located in the wilds of Goias, on the Brazilian highlands, about 600 miles inland from Rio de Janeiro, the former capital. Construction on the city was begun in 1957, during the

administration of President Juscelino Kubitschek. There were no inhabitants in the region and no roads to it. Construction steel and most of the heavy machinery were brought in from the United States. Highways were built through hundreds of miles of uninhabited country to the major coastal cities of Brazil. And Brasilia was dedicated as the new national capital in 1960.

I examined the city of Brasilia, closely and carefully, in January 1963, when it was less than 6 years old. Decay and dilapidation have already set in. It is probably the world's foremost contemporary monument to the folly of a politically motivated, socialistically planned economy.

Oscar Niemeyer, Brazilian architect who helped design the United Nations Building in New York, designed all buildings in Brasilia. Photographed from a distance, they make striking postcards and fine illustrations for an article in National Geographic; but, examined at close range, as places where people are supposed to live and work, they are ugly. Niemeyer himself apparently shares my opinion. He does not live among the modernistic oddities which he designed for other people to occupy: he built for himself and old-fashioned Brazilian colonial outside the city. The futuristic buildings, of spectacular design, reveal inferior construction. Most are still empty and unfinished. Some apartment houses that are occupied, already show signs of becoming slums.

Most of the people in the Federal District of Brasilia still live in the construction-camp slums that formed when workers were first brought in 6 years ago. The costly highways running to the coastal cities are, like the wide avenues of Brasilia, empty of traffic.

President Kubitschek, a leftwing socialist, practically bankrupted his nation to build this preposterous monument to himself. The political argument for his folly was that, by placing the national capital inland, the Government would spur migration from the crowded coastal cities to the vacant interior, where the climate is good, and fertile soil is abundant.

The scheme has failed miserably. Brasilia is a modernistic ghost town, where no one wants to live. Brazilians prefer the fleshpots of Rio.

Without exception, every Brazilian I talked to about Brasilia called it a white elephant. Yet the nation is now stuck with it. Although there is vast quantity of unfinished construction in the city, there is little construction work presently being done. I doubt that it will ever be finished; and the cost of maintaining it as is, for a national capital, is quite enough to overburden the Brazilian economy.

It is impossible to say how much Brazilian tax money and how much American tax money went into the construction of Brasilia. During the 6 years of its existence, we have given the Brazilian Government more than enough to pay for the whole thing; but it is obvious that all of our foreign aid money was not diverted into this gigantic fiasco. Our money has been spread around a bit, to underwrite the activities of other leftwing Brazilian politicians, to line their pockets, and to encourage harmful extravagances on the part of government, and reckless spending on the part of the people.

PRIVATE EXTRAVAGANCE

Aided and encouraged by a foreign government to spend money it does not have, the Brazilian Government feeds the fire of inflation which is consuming the nation. Some of the consequences are obvious, despite thick layers of propaganda, which misrepresent them to the world. Look, for example, at São Paulo, largest city in Brazil, generally called the Chicago of South America, and frequently rhapsodized as a place which inspires

awe, a very model of modern municipal grandeur, a vision of the 21st century.¹

In fact, São Paulo is a grim, and dangerous, monument to reckless economic activity artificially stimulated by a socialistic government. From the downtown hotel room I occupied in São Paulo, I could count upward of 50 unfinished skyscrapers. A casual glance at such evidence of boom and bustle does inspire awe. But a closer look inspires something else.

Work has obviously been abandoned on most of these unfinished buildings. Some of them have been under construction for more than 10 years; and shabby masonry is already crumbling in many buildings which may never be finished and used. No structural steel is used in any of these new skyscrapers. They are built of reinforced concrete columns. The walls are made of a soft, cheap looking locally made brick, poorly laid by unskilled hands. The brick is covered with plaster, and the whole building (those, that is, which have reached this stage of completion) is faced over with a brilliant Brazilian tile which gives an appearance of solidity and beauty.

No one knows whether such buildings could stand a moderate earth tremor, or even a wind of hurricane proportions. An American engineer, who works in São Paulo, expressed to me the fear that one good shock would leave São Paulo a vast heap of broken concrete and shattered masonry. As to that, no one can definitely say; but the economic, social, and political consequences of such construction activity—throwing up, in reckless profusion, costly buildings which are abandoned, to decay and ruin before they are even finished—are obvious.

Some of the unfinished buildings of São Paulo were built with Government money—that is, American tax money, given to the Brazilian Government as foreign aid, and then lent to private speculators. But, apparently, most of the buildings were privately financed.

Why would individuals put their money into such construction, much of which is never finished? Having lost confidence in their currency, they were trying to put it into real estate, something of permanent value. They could get enough money to start a building, from private syndicates which charged interest rates ranging as high as 48 percent per year. But often, before completion, interest and further currency depreciation had consumed all working capital—and no more was available.

AS BRAZIL GOES

Occupying about half of the land area of South America, Brazil dominates the continent. As Brazil goes, so may go the rest of Latin America. And Brazil, in the hands of pro-Communist politicians, whose policies are being financed by American tax money through Alliance for Progress, is headed straight for communism.

A look at recent Brazilian political history should make this clear.

From 1934 to 1945, Getulio Vargas ruled Brazil as a dictator, his administrative system patterned after the corporate state system of Fascist Italy. During his reign, he set up the Brazilian Labor Party, which continued to dominate Brazilian politics even after Vargas was overthrown by the Army in 1945.

Vargas returned to the Presidency in 1950, having won in the elections by an overwhelming majority. In the name of economic nationalism, he socialized the Brazilian petroleum industry and extended Government control over all other industries—even to the extent of limiting the amount of profit which foreign corporations could withdraw from Brazil.

¹ "Giant Brazil," National Geographic, September 1962, p. 306.

Nonetheless, the U.S. Government set up, with Vargas, a joint commission for economic development in Brazil, and supported his schemes. Fear that Vargas (with U.S. aid) was restoring his dictatorship, caused criticism which grew until, in August 1954, Vargas' palace guard attempted to assassinate him. Vargas committed suicide on August 24, 1954.

Elections for a new President were held the following year, 1955. Two of Vargas' followers—Juscelino Kubitschek and Joao Goulart (who had been Secretary of Labor under Vargas)—won the offices of President and Vice President.

Kubitschek and Goulart were inaugurated in January 1956. During the elections of 1955, they had been formally supported by Communists. After their inauguration, they repudiated the Communists, and announced a policy of friendly cooperation with the United States.² This, of course, opened the sluice gates for a flood of American tax dollars which enabled Kubitschek to start the building of Brasilia—and to initiate other policies which sped the chaotic depreciation of Brazilian currency.

Under the Brazilian Constitution, Kubitschek could not succeed himself as president. In the elections of 1960, Janio Quadros was elected President, Joao Goulart was reelected Vice President. They were inaugurated in January 1961.

Quadros proclaimed a neutralist foreign policy. He resumed diplomatic relations with the Communist regimes of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania; he expressed support for the original aspirations of the Cuban revolution of Castro; he exchanged trade missions with Communist China and the Soviet Union—and sent financial envoys to the United States.

Quadros stirred up a storm of protest in Brazil by publicly decorating Che Guevara, Castro's Communist Minister of Finance. The storm never died; and on August 25, 1961—having been in office less than 7 months—President Quadros abruptly resigned and left the country.

The office of President fell to Vice President Goulart, who was on his way back to Brazil from a visit to Communist China.

Goulart's record of leftwing activities—of working with and through Communists and their sympathizers—aroused the fears of many Brazilians, including the military, who opposed his succession to the presidency.

Before Goulart was permitted to become President, the Brazilian Congress adopted a constitutional amendment which set up a parliamentary form of government, transferring principal executive authority from the President to a Council of Ministers.³

When finally inaugurated as President, Goulart surrounded himself with pro-Communist assistants, proclaimed his devotion to the neutralist foreign policy of Quadros—and then made a state visit to the United States. In Washington, he spoke to a joint session of Congress, scolding the American legislators for giving so little money to Brazil, and demanding a new and immediate gift of another \$500 million.⁴

Returning to Brazil with almost groveling assurances, from the Kennedy administration, of increased Alliance for Progress aid, President Goulart, thus elevated in prestige, took immediate steps toward eliminating the parliamentary system so that he could become a virtual dictator.

² Encyclopedia Americana, vol. 4, p. 451 c.

³ This Changing World: For Commanders: Armed Forces Information and Education, published by the Department of Defense, vol. 1, No. 8, Nov. 1, 1961.

⁴ Newsletter of U.S. Representative RICHARD H. POFF (Republican, Virginia), dated Apr. 16, 1962.

His Communist and pro-Communist underlings, working through the Brazilian Labor Party and the unions, incited a series of riots and strikes throughout the nation.⁵ The resulting chaos and economic stagnation created a demand (planted and nourished, of course, by Goulart's henchmen) for elimination of the cumbersome parliamentary system, and for restoration of a strong Presidency which could do something in the crisis.

The Brazilian Congress resisted, but eventually decided that the issue must be put to the people in national plebiscite, to be held on January 6, 1963.

Goulart played his trump card just a short time before the voting occurred. In December, 1962, he proclaimed a law ordering all business firms operating in Brazil to pay an extra month's salary to all workers.

This fine bonus, for which Goulart got credit, did the job it was supposed to do: Goulart won by a 5 to 1 margin in the national plebiscite of January 6, 1963. All obstacles against Goulart becoming an elected pro-Communist dictator—with promises of American Alliance for Progress tax dollars to back him—are now removed.

I talked to responsible Brazilians, and to resident American businessmen, about the December bonus which Goulart ordered all business firms to pay. How could the firms stand such a blow? Simple. American firms (many of which are operating under guarantees-against-loss from the American Government) paid the bonus and took the loss, which would in due course be passed on to American taxpayers.

Brazilian firms which would not stand to pay the bonus were permitted to go under—if their management was not friendly to the Goulart regime, or if the administration wanted to gain control of their properties. Brazilian firms friendly to the Goulart administration were given Federal tax rebates large enough to cover the enforced bonus payments. The resultant loss to the Brazilian national treasury was covered by Alliance for Progress money from the United States, and by more worthless printing-press Brazilian currency.

ALLIANCE FOR POLITICIANS

American aid money enabled Kubitschek to build Brasilia, for the purpose of spurring Brazilians to migrate inland; and American aid money has helped guarantee the failure of the migration scheme.

With American aid money, Brazilian politicians periodically feed and entertain the lazy and illiterate thousands who crowd into the squatters camps of Rio and other large coastal cities. If they moved to the interior, they would have to work—and they would miss all the free fun.

With American aid money, the Brazilian Government also caters to the urban vote by subsidizing certain food costs for certain groups of city voters. Some low-rent Alliance for Progress housing (owned and controlled by the Brazilian Government) has already been completed in the big coastal cities; and vast quantities more are promised. Why should easy-going Brazilians give up the reality and prospects of such easy, American-subsidized living, to face the rigors of work and self-support in the undeveloped interior?

An article entitled "United States Betting on Mexico—But There's Trouble Ahead," in the February 25, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report, reveals that the same sort of thing is happening in Mexico. Indeed, it is happening all over Latin America.

ONLY LEFTWINGERS

The only Latin American politicians which the Kennedy administration will support

⁵ "Toward a Soviet Brazil," by Robert Morris, "The Wanderer," Jan. 17, 1963.

with our Alliance for Progress tax dollars are the leftwingers—Socialists and pro-Communists. Note, for example, this significant item from the front page of the December 17, 1962, issue of the *News*, an English-language newspaper published in Mexico City:

"President Jorge Alessandri of Chile today wound up a week-long visit to the United States, which he is confident helped dispel impressions that his government is too conservative to lead in the drive to bring economic and social reform to Latin America. "Chile and Colombia have been singled out by the Kennedy administration for large-scale aid under the Alliance for Progress."

These leftwing politicians use American money to create socialistic enterprises, thus destroying private enterprise. Note, for example, these passages from the U.S. News & World Report article on Mexico, mentioned above:

"Mexican businessmen and foreign investors are concerned * * * over steady and increasing inroads by the Government into industry and manufacturing * * * a gradual expansion of Government ownership of a vast network of businesses * * * (ranges) from railroads, electric power, petroleum and natural gas, steel mills, and airlines to automobile production and drug manufacture.

"As a result, a new class of public officials has developed in Mexico. These are the directors and administrators of the Government-run industries. They have all the prestige and power of business ownership, plus the power of Government—all without risk of their own money.

To this new type of managers and administrators, it seems perfectly normal that the Government continues to expand its participation in the economy and to regulate that which it does not own. The result has been a marked increase in Government control of business through legislation, decrees, import controls, and licenses."

American tax money is financing this communizing of Mexico—and an even greater program is being planned. Note these passages from the same U.S. News & World Report article:

"Mexico, it now appears, is to be built up as a showplace of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

"Plans for injections of huge sums—up to \$3 billion—into the Mexican economy are under study here by officials of the U.S.-sponsored Alliance and the World Bank."

RESULTS

And what are the results of these injections of huge amounts of American tax money, through the hands of leftwing politicians, into the economy of Mexico? From the U.S. News & World Report article on Mexico:

"Private businessmen, alarmed by this trend (toward Government ownership and control of business) have reacted by spurning new investments in Mexico and turning to less vulnerable investments abroad. Flight of capital from Mexico in 1961, mainly due to concern over this factor, is conservatively estimated at \$150 million."

Private capital in Latin America is the only hope for gradual transformation of agrarian, semifeudalistic societies (through an orderly process of growth) to the point where the people can understand, sustain, and perpetuate modern industrialism.

Our Alliance for Progress money is rapidly driving out all of the private capital and encouraging governments to spend money they do not have. As we pour our tax money in, private investors pull theirs out and stash it away in Swiss banks, or invest it in European industry. At the same time, our aid money is financing the destruction of governmental systems and social arrangements which are the only protection against wild disorder and bloody violence.

And when blood runs in the streets, we will get the blame, because we are so closely identified with the policies producing the disorder. One by one, the Latin American nations (with Brazil, perhaps, in the vanguard) may turn to outright Communist dictatorships as the only way to restore "law and order."

THEY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING

It cannot accurately be said that our governmental leaders do not understand what is happening in Latin America. In the latter part of 1961, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD (New Frontier Democrat from Montana, who is Senate majority leader) spent a few days in Brazil as a member of a Senate study mission. On January 22, 1962, he reported his observations on Brazil to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Here are extracts from Senator MANSFIELD's report:

"Inflation * * * discourages personal savings and impairs long-term investment in productive enterprise. It has pushed interest rates up to 3 and 4 percent a month. A great deal of capital has been diverted into speculative, if spectacular, real estate construction and other enterprises with low social value.

"It is impossible to form an estimate of the amount of indigenous capital that has fled the country and is now held in Europe and the United States. Nevertheless, in informed circles in Brazil, the belief is general that the amount is very great. At the same time, foreign capital is showing hesitancy in flowing into Brazil. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the hesitancy is likely to grow if financial chaos continues to threaten in Brazil and if the recent indications of political hostility to foreign business persist. Within Brazil, moreover, credit has flowed very loosely, encouraging speculation and profiteering. At the same time, there have been large deficits in the Government budgets, year after year.

"For the most part, the * * * poor have poured into and around the cities from rural areas, in the hope of finding living conditions which might be superior to those in the impoverished countryside.

"The northeast contains 25 million inhabitants, more than a third of Brazil's population. It is a region of immense stretches of empty lands, forests, and a few vast agricultural estates, and innumerable subsistence farms. The region has characteristics which are similar to those in impoverished agricultural sectors of the Mediterranean countries * * * and in some underdeveloped regions of Asia. Per capita income is in the neighborhood of \$100 a year. Infant mortality rates are high and average life expectancies short. Illiteracy is widespread. There is a very limited availability of modern medical care and other social services.

"The planning agency for the development of the northeast * * * is known in Brazil as Sudene. The Sudene concept * * * will involve vast outlays of funds, Brazilian and foreign.

"Neither technical shortcomings nor financing, however, may be the major question mark as to the feasibility of the Sudene plan. The more fundamental difficulty may lie in Brazilian society."

There, Senator MANSFIELD puts his finger on one fatal flaw in all of our aid programs to underdeveloped countries. A nation of people who are incapable of producing a complex, modern industrial society are quite incapable of maintaining one. They have had enough contact with modern society to yearn for its material benefits; but, in this yearning, they are like small children who wish for a high-powered automobile to do with as they please. Outside efforts (such as we are making) to give the underdeveloped

"Brazil and United States Policies: Report of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD to the Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate," U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1962.

peoples an industrial economy (before they have gone through generations of slow self-development that is necessary to produce one) will be harmful to them and to others, just as giving the child an automobile would be.

Senator MANSFIELD touches on some of the dangers involved in our aid programs to Brazil (and, similarly, to other Latin American countries). He says:

"This Nation's policies with respect to Brazil tread a very delicate line, particularly as they pertain to the Alliance for Progress. What is not yet clear is whether aid can, in fact, contribute to evolutionary change. On the contrary, there is a strong presumption in present circumstances that significant assistance will not do much more than prolong and intensify the present unsatisfactory situation.

"Moreover, such assistance will link us very closely with that situation, and if it then collapses, all of our interests are likely to be more adversely affected than would otherwise have been the case."

Yet, Senator MANSFIELD continues among the foremost in supporting Kennedy's massive Alliance for Progress aid program.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

I do not know—and, obviously, no one else knows—how to solve these critical problems in South America. Our Government has no constitutional right to try to solve them. We should, therefore, compel the Congress of the United States to stop the Alliance for Progress program abruptly.

Would not all the Latin American nations then turn to communism? Perhaps. But now we are speeding their march toward communism with our aid.

If we pauperized the United States by giving all of our wealth to the cause of promoting a prosperous, stable Latin America, we would still fall; and, by our effort, we would hurt the people of Latin America more than we would help them.

Even if the Latin American people were capable of absorbing and using constructively the help we give them, there is not enough wealth in the United States to raise a nation like Brazil to the level of educational, scientific, cultural, commercial, and industrial development that prevailed in Czechoslovakia in 1948. But even if our aid could uplift Brazil to that extent—would that keep the Communists from taking over, as they took over the advanced and highly developed nation of Czechoslovakia?

The fact is that the disease of communism does not breed in the bellies of men.

STATISTICS

Direct U.S. aid to Alliance for Progress countries from 1946 to August 1962 is as follows:

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Argentina | \$1,027,300,000 |
| Bolivia | 286,400,000 |
| Brazil | 3,193,400,000 |
| Chile | 904,700,000 |
| Colombia | 576,100,000 |
| Costa Rica | 136,700,000 |
| Dominican Republic | 9,400,000 |
| Ecuador | 139,000,000 |
| Guatemala | 207,900,000 |
| Haiti | 127,700,000 |
| Honduras | 54,300,000 |
| Mexico | 1,246,500,000 |
| Nicaragua | \$98,400,000 |
| Panama | 121,100,000 |
| Paraguay | 68,600,000 |
| Peru | 630,600,000 |
| San Salvador | 23,400,000 |
| Uruguay | 120,400,000 |
| Venezuela | 333,600,000 |
| Total | 9,305,500,000 |

"Our Crazy Foreign Giveaway Program," extension of remarks of Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 11, pp. 15511-15513.

ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

On December 30, 1962, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, in his year-end report on progress of the Alliance, asserted that "we cannot afford to waste time by thinking about whether we shall succeed."¹

I am of course delighted when any Government official decries the wasting of time.

But recent reports in the press and recent technical analyses would seem to indicate that the time spent on a reassessment of the objectives of the Alliance and a restatement into more realistic terms would be time well spent;² that a public appraisal of the lessons learned in the course of disbursing \$1.3 billion, including perhaps expanded activity by the General Accounting Office to determine the efficacy of our policies and of their execution, would be time well spent.³

For, the Alliance is not a short-term program. In the Alliance, we are embarked on a program whose duration may be measured in decades rather than in single years, and whose ultimate cost may involve tens of billions of dollars. Under these conditions, it is time well spent to determine whether we are merely working with old disproved remedies in a new overpublicized wrapper, and it is time well spent to investigate the effects of the largesse which the American people increasingly view as indiscriminate, as the information agencies of the Government departments grind out the interminable announcements of the movement of U.S. taxpayers' funds southward. To operate in a climate of panic that does not permit public evaluation of the facts (or public disclosure, to be more exact), and constant reappraisal of the policies, would be to doom the program to inglorious failure.

This is the more true because the Alliance for Progress enjoys the sympathy and support of both parties. There is no political issue dividing us on the sympathy of this country for accelerated economic development in Latin America to the end that all Americans, South Central, and North alike, shall enjoy higher living standards commensurate with the resources with which a bountiful nature has endowed them.

But, I am disturbed by recent reports which picture inter-American relations, as one writer in the London Times recently put it, as "panting with gift-hardened arteries."

I am disturbed by the findings of one of our country's most honored specialists in inter-American relations who could write that the failure of our program in Bolivia "has fed skepticism in Latin America about the viability in Latin America of the whole system, both economic and political, represented by the United States."⁴ This skepticism has in turn rendered Latin Americans more responsive to exaltation of the authoritarian nation-state which sacrifices freedom to forced drought economic development and social reform.⁵

I am disturbed when an experienced journalist on one of our finest papers can report from the field: "There is an alarming tendency (in Colombia anyway) to view the problems of the local economies as essentially a thing for the Alliance for Progress to deal with. Almost like: Thank God, the big

brother has finally come to the rescue—let him handle it."⁶

I am disturbed when a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System returns from Latin America to report that "we may be mistaking the symptoms for the disease which is really more deep seated. If this is true, our prescribed remedies will be ineffective, and they may in some cases be harmful."⁷

And I am disturbed when, after an expenditure of around a quarter-billion dollars in a small country like Bolivia, Bolivian officials could accuse us of "ulterior imperialistic motives," and a Bolivian official on whom AID relies largely for implementing its program can charge that "the Alliance for Progress had evolved in response to the circumstances of the strategic expansion of U.S. capitalism," that it was essentially a method to unload surpluses for which our economic system had been unable to provide an outlet.

Since the Alliance is largely concerned with more effective mobilization of domestic resources in Latin America, the role of private U.S. investment, the establishment of suitable priorities in the expenditure of Government funds, the preparation of national plans, and integration through the Latin American Common Market, let us look at recent reports under these headings:

DOMESTIC CAPITAL: THE FLIGHT FROM LATIN AMERICA

One of the deficiencies in the Latin American economies which the Alliance purports to seek to correct is the shortage of developmental capital. But are we doing anything more than replacing domestic capital that is fleeing from the Latin American countries, or even facilitating that flight?

Early in January, an official of the International Monetary Fund reported that "in the 5 years ending 1961 private residents of Latin America, other than banks, increased their investments in the United States by approximately \$1 billion."⁸ Since this does not include the flight of capital to safe havens in Switzerland and other European safe havens, nor the variously concealed movement of hidden assets that is hard to identify statistically, we are clearly confronted with a major obstacle to any serious success from the flow of U.S. Government funds which is merely compensatory with this outflow. For, in the period cited, U.S. Government assistance to Latin America totaled around \$1.3 billion, clearly not enough to balance the flight of domestic capital to Europe and the United States.

And since that time the flight of capital from Latin America has expanded.

Are the policies of the Alliance serving to generate a flight of capital or are they discouraging it?

Mr. James L. Robertson, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, writes: "I suggest that the remedy for this does not lie in the substitution of government-provided capital for private capital. It does not lie in the attempts to locate and forcibly repatriate Latin American capital deposited in American or Swiss banks. It does not lie in exhortation or special tax measures designed to persuade Americans

to step up their investments in the less-developed countries."⁹

Net assistance to Latin America by U.S. Government

[Millions of dollars]

| | Economic | Military |
|-------------------|----------|----------|
| 1st quarter, 1961 | 90 | 31 |
| 2d quarter, 1961 | 83 | 17 |
| 3d quarter, 1961 | 252 | 57 |
| 4th quarter, 1961 | 277 | 18 |
| 1st quarter, 1962 | 162 | 26 |
| 2d quarter, 1962 | 190 | 16 |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

In December, an economist associated with the National Planning Association estimated that the flight of capital from Latin America had been \$700 million in 1961 and perhaps at the rate of \$600 million per year in the first 6 months of 1962.¹⁰ This estimated flight of \$1 billion in 18 months compares with United States net assistance to Latin America during that period of \$1.05 billion.

To view this situation with complacency, to conclude that AID's "accepted remedy" of infusion of still larger amounts of U.S. Treasury funds is unchallengeable, and to assert that there is no time to waste in considering whether the program thus conceived will succeed, is for me a bit too disdainful of the sweat and blood that go into the accumulation of money by our taxpayers.

ROLE OF U.S. PRIVATE CAPITAL

If there is one thesis which carries through virtually all congressional hearings on the Alliance for Progress, it is that which pertains to the vital and decisive role of private capital. Over and over, we have been told that unless private capital flows into direct investments at a sustained and significant pace, the Alliance must fail of its objectives. Most frequently, the administration has cited \$300 million as its minimum expectation for the annual flow of private capital from the United States into direct investments in Latin America.

In the first 6 months of 1961, the net direct investment by private capital in Latin America was \$143 million. In the 15 months ending September 30, 1962, not only has there been no direct investment, but actually there has been a net withdrawal of some \$35 million.

Net direct investment in Latin America

[Millions of dollars]

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| 1st quarter 1961 | 50 |
| 2d quarter 1961 | 93 |
| 3d quarter 1961 | 1 |
| 4th quarter 1961 | 3 |
| 1st quarter 1962, withdrawal | 29 |
| 2d quarter 1962 | 5 |
| 3d quarter 1962, withdrawal | 13 |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

In other words, while a flow of \$300 million was labeled the decisive element for success of the Alliance for Progress, there has been instead a withdrawal rather than a net investment.

The response of the administration to this disastrous turn of events has been first, to substitute even more Government money for the flow of private capital which had failed to materialize, and second, to search out devices for guarantees, tax avoidance, etc., that would shift all the risks onto the U.S. Treasury and create a situation of private investment at public risk.

¹ Op. cit.

² Frank Brandenburg, National Planning Association, "Looking Ahead," December 1962. He puts the flight at \$500 million annually from 1953-59, \$750 million in 1960, \$700 million in 1961. There are no reliable data on this subject.

¹ AID press release No. A-112.

² Editorial in *Business Week*, Dec. 22, 1962: "The administration has clearly discovered from bitter experience, especially with the Alliance for Progress, that its original goals were unrealistic."

³ Moscoso said that "since July 1961 the United States has committed \$1.5 billion to the Alliance for Progress, and has disbursed \$1.3 billion." That is, July 1961 to December 1962.

⁴ Prof. Arthur Whitaker (University of Pennsylvania), "Nationalism in Latin America" (University of Florida Press, 1962).

I suggest to you that this approach neglects completely the underlying factors, that it is the bureaucrat's familiar device of seeking out the easiest remedy which is always deemed to be a fresh addition to the burden on the U.S. Treasury, and I suggest that it must ultimately prove ineffective.

For, this approach fails completely to attack the factors that discourage the flow of capital into Latin America. It is for the Latin American governments to comprehend which of their policies are responsible for the discouragement of investment and to act so as to correct them. If they are, instead, determined to prejudice their development by constant threat of expropriation and discrimination against private investment, they must accept the consequences of a slowdown in the pace of economic development.

Recently, a very experienced executive in oversea operations, who happens to work in my State of Illinois, commented that "the United States would not have to be offering insurance on investments abroad if it had done a proper job of protecting such investments earlier. If the United States really supported oversea investments other nations would be afraid to attempt expropriation."¹⁰

It is typical of the course of the Alliance for Progress that when the Congress passed the Hickenlooper amendment in order to discourage confiscation of U.S. investments, an attempt was made to avoid its implementation. As you will recall, or a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 2, 1962, will refresh your memory, testimony was adduced by affected businessmen to the effect that our representatives were told that the U.S. Embassy had received instructions not to make representations to the Government based on the Hickenlooper amendment, and the senior Senator from Oregon was prompted to remark on the floor of the Senate that "the law is crystal clear. There is a deliberate attempt on the part of the State Department to ignore and evade the law. I consider the State Department to be guilty of malfeasance in office with regard to the situation in Honduras."

It may well be that we are on the way to finding out from the methods of the Alliance for Progress that giving makes beggars. It is certainly already clear that closing our eyes to the causes of the present impasse on private-capital flow and throwing onto the U.S. Treasury the burden thus created by economic ignorance and/or prejudice in Latin America can only bring about an even greater deterioration by encouraging the very prejudices and miscomprehension that have already gravely damaged the hopes for success of the Alliance.

To substitute U.S. Government funds for private investment on the theory that it is too difficult for Latin Americans to achieve an understanding of the requirements for economic development, and to insist that there is no time to evaluate whether this defiance of principle fatally prejudices our program, is a reckless abandonment of the pledges made to the Congress during the appropriations hearings and shows all too careless a spirit of "apres moi, le deluge."

THE ROLE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

Already, the catering to this prejudice against private capital and the willingness to reward such prejudice with an expanded flow of U.S. Government money has contaminated still another phase of the Alliance that had been stressed by the administration as of decisive importance; namely, the role of the Latin American common market (LAFTA).

Mr. Moscoso has said that "the only reasonable hope of attaining what we desire (from the Alliance for Progress) depends

upon the creation of a Latin American common market."

But the Latin American common market had hardly been conceived on paper, when prominent Latin American officials and technicians began to worry aloud about the potential beneficiaries of accelerated economic development, particularly about the possibility that foreign-owned ventures within the area might benefit from the reduction of tariff barriers within the Latin American common market.

Already, then, there is an extension of the violent and uneconomic nationalism that has continually frustrated Latin America's economic development. Even so widely respected an economist as Raul Prebisch, long the area's most distinguished economist, has written: "Some apprehension is felt lest the benefits of the common market be reaped mainly by foreign instead of domestic enterprises. I share these misgivings and I do so not merely in imagination."¹¹

Now, the Latin Americans know that the proportion of U.S. employees to total employment provided by oversea investments of U.S. firms is very small and tends ever smaller. In 1962, it was reported that only one in every hundred oversea workers employed by U.S. firms (including the executive structure) were U.S. citizens, and the pressure of self-interest on the part of the companies is making for acceleration of reliance on nationals of the countries where the investments are located, as quickly as suitable training can be effected.¹² Thus, in terms of jobs which a foreign firm would provide within the Latin American common market, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms frustrate economic development.

The Latin Americans know that in terms of wage policy, or the relationship of taxes-paid to profits or sales or investments, or the degree of abstention from corruption, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms frustrate economic development.

They know that the area is deficient in capital, and it must long remain so if the challenges for a better life for more people in Latin America are to be met. Thus, in terms of drawing on the savings of the more industrialized nations, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms contribute to a frustrating of economic development.

And in terms of technology, in a world where technology advances continuously and often at breathtaking speeds, the Latin Americans know that maximum mobilization of every technological advance that can be adapted to the needs of their area is vital to development. And that it is most likely to come in a climate of competitive pressure for productivity (and its source, technological advance), which means inviting production by companies with the skills and techniques most recently evolved.

Has development been frustrated by the fact that one-tenth of the gross product of the Latin American area is accounted for by sales of U.S. companies' direct-investment properties in Latin America? Has development been frustrated by the fact that roughly one-third of Latin America's exports originate with the direct-investment companies? Has the employment provided to roughly 1 million persons been prejudicial to them, as against alternative outlets for their talents? Is it likely that tax collections would have been greater if the area had been able to avoid the approximately one-fifth of its government revenues which come from these U.S. direct investments?

If, then, it is clear that foreign private investment is an immense accelerating force for development, the misgivings which already dominate Latin American technical thinking on the subject of the place of foreign investors in economic integration raise serious doubts as to the real objectives of the common-market movement.

Surely, it would be time well spent to determine whether the support that is to be given the common market by the United States is actually designed to provide the final blow to private-capital flow, not only in terms of the loss of opportunity for U.S. firms, but also and much more importantly because it might strike heavily at the hope for economic development at the pace which the Alliance purports to believe vital.

THE USE OF U.S. FUNDS

On January 12, the *Economist* (London) noted that "40 percent of the money that was provided for development in Latin America in the first year of the Alliance for Progress has been spent in propping up budgets and stopping up holes in the balance of payments * * * . How little permanent economic or political good is done by such help has just been demonstrated by the latest emergency in Brazil."

A study prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported that the "misuse of our public assistance dollars" was such that we were bailing out European creditors who have gained markets in Latin America in competition with American firms, that we were providing loans to enable Latin American countries to meet their credit obligations to European creditors while at the same time we have no control over the original expenditures.¹³

A business newsletter notes that top priority in use of U.S. official donations to Bolivia has apparently been designated to the servicing of defaulted dollar bonds held by speculators either here or in Europe, bonds denounced from the White House as early as Franklin D. Roosevelt's early term. This, on condition that Bolivia would not be expected to service its obligations at the Export-Import Bank (some \$35 million), and that it would be provided with the \$929,000 for the purpose on top of the tens of millions of dollars being provided that country.¹⁴

A distinguished foreign correspondent of the Chicago Tribune and countless other reporters out of Argentina have referred to the quickness with which an official investigation into corruption in the use of public funds was terminated when suspicion began to attach to officials still in the government with respect to award of public contracts without open bidding which had resulted not only in discrimination against U.S. exporters but also in delivery by competitors of unsuitable and unusable goods. Yet, every such waste of foreign exchange serves only to enhance the dollar gap which AID is filling out of the U.S. Treasury without complaint against such practices.

If, indeed, there is no time to be spent on thinking about whether we shall succeed, shall we conclude that 10 cents on the dollar is the most that is needed for success in this program, that is to say, that we need spend effectively only 10 cents out of every dollar drawn from the U.S. Treasury to make the program successful? Is the financial requirement of the Alliance for Progress so small and the resources of the U.S. Treasury for the purpose so great that only 10 cents of every dollar needs to be expended efficiently?

Can we finance a mounting corruption in an area where corruption in the expenditure of public funds had long been a deterrent to development, and still achieve the aims of

¹⁰ Raul Prebisch, "Economic Aspects of the Alliance," the Alliance for Progress (Johns Hopkins Press, 1962) p. 35.

¹¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 13, page 18174.

¹² Senate Foreign Relations Committee: United States-Latin American Relations: Some Observations on the Operation of the Alliance for Progress. Aug. 3, 1962.

¹³ Hanson's Latin American letter, No. 930.

the Alliance? Can we finance the proliferation of the bureaucracy, national and international alike, in an area where the swollen bureaucracies had long taken their toll of the economic potential, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance? Can we finance our competitors in foreign trade at the expense of U.S. exporters, even where it involves simultaneously great waste of foreign exchange, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance? Can we meet local currency expenditures for purposes that properly fall within the ordinary budgets of these countries in order that the local citizenry may run free of taxes and even have a surplus of capital to hide abroad, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance?

After a decade of such a program in Bolivia, we are defraying a large part of ordinary budgetary expenditures, we are paying wages directly to the swollen work force in government entities, we are underwriting the sale of German mining equipment, we are encouraging expropriation without compensation, we are swelling our donations in order that the international agencies should not have to suffer defaults on their loans, we have even bolstered the Communists' interest in delivering equipment by our promises of unlimited financing for the foreign-exchange gap which is created largely through the Bolivian official policies. (The Communists had lagged in negotiations because they wanted gold clauses and other assurances of payment, until the Bolivians were able to point to the certainty of U.S. funds in abundance). And after all this activity, we find that the standard of living in Bolivia has fallen steadily, we find ourselves profoundly disliked, and only last month, the press reported that some 29 organizations in Bolivia had petitioned the CIA to investigate the use of U.S. aid money to create the Marxist economy in Bolivia.

NATIONAL PLANNING

Nor does it suffice to justify such a performance by reference to national plans. Admittedly, the Alliance has stressed the making of national plans to assure maximum effectiveness in use of available resources.

Let us be frank. If conditions for an inflow of private capital are deliberately avoided, if conditions stimulating an outflow of capital are deliberately encouraged, if corruption is encouraged by the willingness of the United States to supply funds to cover any amount of waste, if government enterprises are to be encouraged to maximize their ineffectiveness by the availability of U.S. funds at virtually no cost, if trade competitors for the available foreign exchange are to be allowed to wrest the business away from lower-price offers (whether American or other) in order to provide a pork barrel for officials, what in the world is the sense of harping constantly on national plans as the key to accelerated economic development?

Recently, a Fulbright scholar in company with a member of the faculty of the University of Chile referred to the much-cited Chilean 10-year plan as a "book of prayers; it simply projects various quantities in various sectors to achieve a desired growth figure; there is no discussion of how the goal is to be reached."¹⁵ And each recent announcement of additions to the donations to Bolivia have been identified as part of the national plan adopted by Bolivia, even though members of the U.S. aid team have long since ceased to come to the Hill with their reports of economic progress in Bolivia, after the long years of protesting that "just another year" would show the expected results.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

Some weeks ago it was announced that funds would be provided for a public-rela-

tions campaign for the Alliance for Progress to gain greater acceptability among Americans, North and South alike.

We need something far more than we need a public-relations campaign. This program needs a shakedown in objectives to realistic terms, it needs far greater honesty in presentation of the operational facts, and it needs acceptance by the administration that the taxpayers will not be satisfied with a 10 cents on the dollar performance not only because they resent the waste of funds but also because such a performance dooms the Alliance for Progress to failure.

Above all, in a program of such extended duration and of such heavy cost, let us have the truth. When we make a loan for 40 years, with a 10-year grace period, with interest at 1 percent, let the debtor know, as well as our own people, that this money is going to be costing us perhaps 4 percent per year, that it will involve an enormous cost to the American people. When we make a loan repayable in the currency of the borrower and with the understanding that the borrower will continue to use that local currency, let the debtor as well as the American people appreciate that we are making in effect concealed donations. Last year Mr. Fowler Hamilton, Administrator of AID, said that "we use the word 'loan' sometimes in a very Pickwickian sense." Perhaps it would help if we restored the old meanings to the words "loans," "donations," "economic progress," "economic retrogression." And above all, let us never get the idea that we lack the time to measure the progress of this program and the likelihood of its success.

[From Hanson's Latin American Letter, Dec. 29, 1962]

YEAR OF DECISION FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN LATIN AMERICA—1963: END OF AN ERA

In the first 21 months of the Kennedy administration, net private direct investment in Latin America declined to \$5 million per month. In the same period, the amount of short-term credit outstanding for Latin America expanded by some \$5 million per month. But in the 9 months ending October 1, 1962, net private direct investment ceased, and there was instead a withdrawal of some \$4 million per month. In the same period, the banks were shortening their credit lines by some \$3 million per month. Under the cessation of the most effective form of developmental assistance, the Latin American economies stagnated.

U.S. direct investment in Latin America

[In millions of dollars]

| | Net withdrawal of capital | Net capital flow to Latin America |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 9 months to Oct. 1, 1962 | 37 | |
| 9 months to Oct. 1, 1961 | | 144 |

BASIS FOR ONLY CONCERN?

"There is a basis for concern but not for alarm," the head of the great international law firm of Anderson Clayton & Co. was quoted in Daily News Record (Fairchild publications), "and our company has sought during the year to exercise particular care in hedging and safeguarding its operations in Latin America." The data on cessation of net investment as issued by the U.S. Government confirm the widespread "concern," but for the year 1963, it is the significance of the larger trends in investment climate that warrants alarm.

ISSUE SHIFTS TO EXISTING INVESTMENTS IN

1963

For new private direct investment in Latin America, an era ended in 1961-62. Now, in 1963, the capacity of existing captive investments to survive profitably will be tested in most strenuous fashion. The outlook is not

bright. When the Kennedy administration took office, it was willing to forecast that unless private capital flowed into direct investments in Latin America at the rate of \$25 million per month and was sustained for a decade at that level or higher, the Alliance for Progress was dead.

Now, the climate for direct investment having been destroyed partly by the fumbling of that very Alliance for Progress, the issue is being blanketed in meaningless rhetoric such as the President offered up on December 26; namely, that change in Latin America is going to come through either "revolution and communism or through peaceful democratic means."

VIABILITY OF ECONOMIC SYSTEM REPRESENTED BY UNITED STATES

As the great test moves from stagnation through cessation of new investment to retrogression through withdrawal or weakening of existing investment, there is basis not merely for concern but for alarm, because we are moving to the core of the problem. And we have already had a demonstration of what this means. Had the administration not limited itself to conduct of our Latin American policy by persons without experience in the field, it would know that the prospective retrogression stemming from discouragement of private investment has already been tested:

"The failure of the U.S. program in Bolivia," writes a former officer of the State Department who has been showered with countless academic honors here and abroad for his expertise in the field, "has fed skepticism in Latin America about the viability in Latin America of the whole system, both economic and political, represented by the United States." * * * This skepticism in turn has rendered Latin Americans more responsive to exaltation of the authoritarian nation-state which sacrifices freedom to forced draught economic development and social reform."

"Economically," writes this famed expert on Latin American affairs, "the (Bolivian) experiment has hardly justified itself, for despite a substantial and steady flow of aid from the United States, Bolivia is nevertheless today on the verge of bankruptcy, so that even politically its prospects are not promising."

Significantly, the Bolivian economy collapsed precisely because of the expropriation of the leading private industry. And it is precisely expropriation, though possibly in the form of silent (discouragement of effective operations) expropriation, which is in prospect elsewhere in Latin America now.

And it was the Kennedy-Eisenhower decision to solve the Bolivian situation with "a conciliatory policy which may be characterized as one of killing Marxism and Yankeophobia with kindness," to use Professor Whitaker's words, which fostered the skepticism about the viability of the system represented by the United States in Latin America. And it is precisely this policy which is about to spread its effects to the other countries.

THE KEY?

For Senator HUMPHREY, who sometimes seems to be trying to usurp the role exercised by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America, the success or failure of our Latin America program may rest with the experience in Mexico and Venezuela. But informed analysts continue to believe that Brazil is the key country. And, unfortunately, nowhere has the administration failed so badly as in the major decisions regarding Brazil.

WHY THE PUBLIC ATTACK ON BRAZIL?

On December 12, after almost 2 years of intervention by our Embassy in Brazilian politics in a manner that would once have led to expulsion of the Ambassador, the President of the United States chose to single

¹⁵ Becket & Griffin, "Revolution in Chile?" New Republic, Dec. 29, 1962.

out Brazil for a public branding as a country where now "there is nothing really that the United States can do that can possibly benefit the people of Brazil." Why Brazil? Was Brazil the only country in Latin America where "inflation eats up our aid," where there is a flight of capital, where inflation diminishes the stability of the state?

Only a few days before, the Agency for International Development had been compelled secretly to order Argentina to restore to it certain of the funds (from the \$20 million balance-of-payments loan) that had been illegally and improperly used by the Argentines in willful disregard of the stipulations regarding the loan. Had the President publicized this? Instead, simultaneously the State Department had approved additional enormous concealed grants for Argentina.

Again, the flight of capital involving almost a tenth of receipts from export earnings in Argentina exceeded the flight from Brazil. Had this been regarded as a fit subject for White House propaganda?

Again, inflation in Argentina at a pace as meaningful as that of Brazil, had not been accompanied by the terrific economic growth seen in Brazil so that the decline in real wages had been much more acute. Had this been publicized?

Or, take the case of Chile. Only the day before the blast at Brazil, the President had lauded "the untiring effort of the Chilean Government to improve the life of the people of Chile." And he had personally furthered the negotiations for an immense flow of concealed donations to Chile.

How had the President reached his differentiation between Brazil and Chile? The Chilean economy was stagnating despite the fact that it had suffered no such adverse alteration in terms of trade as Brazil was struggling with. The flight of capital from Chile had been greater relatively than from Brazil and in no small part had involved a two-step maneuver involving the movement of U.S. aid money to Chile and thence to safe havens in Europe. Uncontrollable inflation had been virtually a Chilean characteristic for all the years of this century. And if there was stability politically, it remained true that informed analysts in Washington considered the prospect of a Communist-oriented regime taking office in Chile to be greater than the prospect of such a disaster in Brazil.

Again, Chilean trade with Castro had been greater than that of Brazil with Castro.

And what of the reforms that were used to justify the new inflated program of concealed donations for Chile? No one in Washington challenged the recently published view that "Chile's 10-year plan is just a book of prayers for which there is no discussion even of how the goal is to be reached" * * * that the tax reform program does little more than restore the efficiency of a collection system that had already existed 5 years before and might in any case never be accepted in practice * * * that the agrarian reforms will not change the distribution of income and power nor increase investment and instead were more likely to benefit a very small minority at the expense of the great majority." Was it Brazil's failure to parallel this Chilean achievement that so disturbed the White House?

In Washington, reporters are given to understand that the President was speaking after a briefing by the U.S. Ambassadors and that in some mysterious way the blast at Brazil ties in with some political strategy devised by the American Embassy.

But to what end?

THE DEMANDS OF GOURLART

A clue may have been provided in the subjects on which the younger Kennedy is alleged to have informed President Goulart that the White House wants action: a settlement on the expropriated properties and a

promise to implement with compensation a scheme for the full withdrawal of U.S. interests from the utility field, discouragement of the expansion of trade with the Communist bloc, fiscal reforms, accelerated social reforms.

In themselves, these subjects reveal the confusion and ineptitude that is dooming both this relationship with Brazil and in the course of it the whole Latin American program. Some facts are clear:

1. For at least a decade and maybe more, Brazil will have no funds whatsoever to devote to disinvestment by foreign interests. If, then, there is a position to be agreed upon, it is that in the absence of capacity to compensate promptly and effectively, what is needed now is a deferral of the aspiration for nationalization of utilities. Instead, the Embassy and the President are putting the interests of the American Foreign Power Co. ahead of the interests of the United States in relations with Brazil, in anticipation of the fact that means can be found to have the U.S. Treasury indirectly pay off American Foreign Power Co. at the expense of genuine developmental assistance.

2. Since all of the major allies of the United States are engaged in shipping to the Communist bloc goods which would be considered of strategic assistance to the Communists if an American manufacturer wanted to ship them, it is rather childish to attempt to interfere with the movement of commodities having no strategic importance from Brazil to the Communist bloc. And since it is U.S. assistance to the Communist bloc countries that enables them to divert resources into exports to Brazil, it is rather ridiculous to attempt to interfere with Brazilian trade relations.

But above all, there is a need, first, to realize that the United States cannot set one standard for Brazil and another standard for all others. Sometime, somehow it is going to be necessary either to approach the Brazilian situation with the standards used in Argentina, and Chile, and Bolivia, or to bring our treatment of these other nations to the stern test which allegedly the administration proposes to use on Brazil.

As the year 1962 ends, the United States is so deeply embroiled by choice in internal politics in Argentina, in Brazil, in Chile (and not so long ago in Peru in that memorable fiasco of diplomacy) that every investor should realize that he now must expect to be confronted not only with the traditional and deepening displays of nationalism, but also with resistance stemming from the fumbling of the U.S. Government through our embassies. It is not only what the left is doing to the climate of investment that is a cause for alarm rather than mere concern, as the year 1963 opens. It is the total confusion regarding "specific and attainable goals" in Washington that should alarm and prompt caution on the part of the investor.

ARGENTINE TRADE

P.S.—We recommend to our Argentine readers that they study carefully a publication titled "Foot-and-Mouth Disease in U.S. Policy," published by the Food Research Institute of Stanford University. The report was written by an extremely able researcher, E. Louise Peffer, and reaches some very important conclusions for everyone interested in Argentine-American trade.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, May 18, 1962]

BEFORE CASTRO, BOLIVIA

TAMPA.—Someone should tell Drew Pearson that Bolivia shows signs of distress, not progress.

It is true that on April 9 the Government and MNR Party of Bolivia celebrated the 10th anniversary of the revolution. This revolution plunged the entire country into misery and hunger, and into the hands of Commu-

nist followers, just as the Cuban revolution has done. Herein lies a lesson for those who did not believe Castro was a Communist and still think that you have to carry a card to prove it.

Bolivia illustrates this problem, and it had as many problems and handicaps. The MNR with the help of its members (among whom there are several that carry cards of the International Communist Party, including Vice President Juan Lechin), took over the Government after a bloody and long revolution.

What was their first step? You guessed it. Expatriate their opponents, and eliminate the most dangerous ones, including 200 cadets of the military academy. They established concentration camps and the infamous Gestapo-like milicia.

Later, they took over the mines from the famous tin barons, and did not pay them (in the Castro manner) 1 cent of indemnity. They took over the land from the so-called land barons, who in their immense wealth owned a few acres of land, cultivated this acreage and helped to give work and food to hundreds of thousands of the exploited Indians.

The United States of America under the Eisenhower administration poured millions of taxpayers' dollars into Bolivia. Where did it all go? Not to help the miners, because in spite of the money, production stopped and they had to pay salaries without producing an ounce of tin. The money did not help to improve the agriculture, import machinery, or build schools.

In fact, it helped no one. Hunger was soon felt and the monetary currency dropped from 120 bolivianos for each dollar to 4,000 bolivianos. A pound of meat was bought before the revolution at 21 bolivianos and after 2 years of progress at 4,000 bolivianos, so where did the money, your money, go? It went to banks in Switzerland to the accounts of members of the Government like Mr. Paz Estenssoro and Juan Lechin. I knew for a fact the latter gave a party celebrating his first million dollars in the bank.

The U.S. dollars well intended no doubt, but badly managed, helped to strengthen the milicia, and sent thousands of party members on trips to Europe and the United States. It gave their children cars and money to spend on parties. It helped corrupt the morals of the hungry ones. This small party and its members have been in power for 10 years now. It is the same story as in Cuba. People are hungry, prices are exorbitant, and people are being killed without protest from anyone. Just now, the latest help from the American Government went to help strengthen the milicia, who in turn destroys homes and robs and kills.

How do I know these things? Because I am a Bolivian citizen, a refugee from the first Communist government in Latin America. I'm thankful now to be here enjoying the liberty that many take for granted in this wonderful land.

How does Mr. Pearson know the things he has recently written? Has he lived there year after year? Does he still have his family there like we do? Has he been informed of the wonderful progress of my poor country at a banquet given by their oppressors, or by Juan Lechin on his visit to New York? Answer please. I would like to know his erroneous source of information.

Mrs. G.S.S.

[From Hanson's Latin American Letter, Feb. 2, 1963]

AID SETS THE GUIDANCE FOR U.S. DONATIONS

The Agency for International Development (AID) has at long last provided Latin America with a definitive guideline for qualification for major Alliance for Progress assistance. On January 21, 1963, Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, asserted that "one of the most encouraging elements in the forward march

of the Alliance for Progress" has been "Argentina's remarkable effort to develop her economy;" that is to say, "the dynamism of Argentina's efforts to tackle the difficult social and economic problems."

Thus, every country in Latin America is invited by AID to compare its economic achievements with those of Argentina, and to try if possible to match the record made in the Plate. Here is the Argentine achievement as outlined by reports from the American Embassy in Buenos Aires:

THE MODEL: ARGENTINE

1. The cost of living rose by more than 2.5 percent per month in 1962, but by the end of the year, as the momentum of the remarkable effort accelerated, the increase in cost of living rose to 3.7 percent per month; i.e., roughly 45 percent per year.

2. Unpaid bills of the Argentine Treasury have risen by 35 percent in the year 1962, the cash deficit of the Argentine Treasury is running double that of a year ago, Argentine tax revenues are failing to cover as much as two-thirds of public expenditures, the Government has consistently been in arrears on payment of salaries to public employees despite the fact that it used monkey money (the 9th-of-July bonds) to pay wages in some months. And just as importantly, as the remarkable effort continues, the deterioration in accelerating in all areas of public finance.

3. The tax reform and tax reorganization which were played up to the U.S. Congress during the 1962 hearings on foreign aid have turned out to be a hoax. On July 25, when the remarkable effort had brought Argentina to bankruptcy, Mr. Moscoso told the House Appropriations Subcommittee that "Argentina is in about the worst financial condition it has been in for some time," but that thanks to the tax reforms initiated in response to the Alliance for Progress, tax collections had risen from \$800 million in 1959 to \$1.8 billion in 1961. Now, the reforms in public finance, which were never as publicized, are in a state of open collapse.

4. No agricultural or land reforms of serious content have proven acceptable, and instead AID has now indicated that it is prepared to use U.S. dollars to buy land from the large landowners on behalf of tenant farmers, thereby providing a concealed subsidy on balance of payments, and providing ready cash for the wealthier elements of the community to accelerate their flight of capital from Argentina.

5. Both the short-term outlook for export earnings and the long-term outlook are deteriorating. With the grains and hides in trouble for 1963, the remarkable effort will find it difficult to maintain \$1.2 billion of exports, of which some 8 percent is being lost to Argentina by a flight of capital which may accelerate as the elections approach.

It must be remembered, as the British financial weekly, the Statist, correctly warns, that it is nonsense to assert that "all will be well if there is a return to democratic government," for "Argentina was well within the grip of economic crisis before the end of 1961." This letter was among the "minority of observers" who rejected the bullish talk regarding the Argentine situation in the late Frondizi period, which we pointed out at the time stemmed largely from wishful thinking by the State Department and seemingly a collapse of technical analysis by the IMF.

(6) U.S. officials have been apprised by the bulk of the petroleum community in Argentina that an orderly revision of petroleum contracts held by the newcomers to Argentina is inevitable and even desirable in the interest of long-range stability for developmental activity. But the regime has chosen instead to reject the demands for concession revision and thus intensified the ultimate political explosion which may drive all companies from the country.

(7) Most important to the objectives of the Alliance for Progress, the Argentines by their "remarkable effort" have succeeded in reducing gross national product in a single year by 4 to 8 percent, which is a tremendous single year achievement, hardly surpassed by their previous "accomplishments" in lowering gross national product. In addition, since this has been accompanied by a decline in real wages, Argentina can correctly claim to have widened the disparity between the upper income groups and the lower income groups in 1962, which again is a tremendous achievement.

QUID PRO QUO: BRAZIL

The sarcasm, with which we outline the "achievement" which the State Department asserts to be the model that it will reward with disproportionate assistance, and is in fact already rewarding, is not diluted by consideration of the quid pro quo about which the press has been informed. Before the Argentine Foreign Minister reached Washington, a leak was planted with the press to the effect that the State Department planned to discuss with the foreign minister ways and means of dealing with the Brazilian situation "because of his intimate knowledge of the Brazilian situation."

After the talks with the Argentine Foreign Minister, it was revealed that Argentina had agreed to reorganize some of its army units so that a brigade would be available as a troubleshooting force to rush into Latin American countries when the extreme left threatened. Virtually all readers of this letter are experienced Latin Americanists. Despite the comedy of errors to which our Latin American policy has been reduced in the past 2 years, they will be amazed now to learn (if they have not already studied the story in the Washington newspapers) that the administration feels that an Argentine army brigade could be used, for instance, in Brazil should the extreme left threaten. Nothing could more quickly drive Brazil into the Communist camp than the use by Washington of Argentine troops on Brazilian soil.

Since the Congress is known to look with disfavor on ventures of the type involved in the Argentine brigade or brigades, initial press comment suggested that the administration feels it may be able to equip the brigade without going to the Congress for money and may thus escape the scrutiny of the Congress.

THE BRAZILIAN SITUATION

Our comments are not intended to minimize the importance of the administration's view of the Brazilian situation. Only last week, the Chicago Daily News quoted the Senate minority leader as saying that "it would not surprise me at all if within the next 60 to 90 days we had a crisis of major proportions in Brazil." And Senator DIRKSEN has a reputation for being well briefed by the White House.

SHOWDOWN SOUGHT BY WHITE HOUSE IN BRAZIL

There is every evidence that the White House is pushing for a showdown in Brazil. And success for the White House is by no means assured, for the Brazilian people, like most Latin Americans, may choose their own politicians in preference to U.S. politicians, if the showdown reduces to such a choice. As this letter is written, reports are reaching the United States of the latest participation by Brazil's new political party (the American Embassy) in internal debate of local issues. This time the American Embassy has gone out of its way to blast a paper drafted by a Brazilian diplomatic official who is definitely not anti-United States as a device for entering into local debate in the harshest manner. Oddly enough, the paper had been drafted only as a contribution to repair of the image of Brazil in the United States. Have we reached the point where the White House

is opposed to efforts to restore the traditional relationship with Brazil?

It ill behooves the State Department to slap Brazil's face publicly for its failure to effect "complementary policies in the budgetary, monetary, and foreign exchange fields," at a time when it is setting up Argentina as a model to which disproportionate assistance is to be given as a reward for its success in steadily reducing its gross national product per capita, increasing the gap between the rich and the poor, displaying a collapse of public finance policies which makes the Brazilian public finances look good by comparison, increasing the rise in cost of living to a pace of 45 percent per year, taking measures in export production that reduce chances for expansion of exchange earnings.

It ill becomes the White House in an open press conference to slap down Brazil hard by saying that there is now nothing left that can be done for the Brazilian people, and a few weeks later, to say that "we are analyzing what we can most helpfully do to be of assistance to Argentina," when the Argentine economic and political collapse is if anything worse than that of Brazil.

It has become an imperative of U.S. policy that the American Ambassador to Brazil demit office now. Whatever his Embassy may have accomplished on behalf of I.T. & T. and the American Foreign Power Co., it has failed dismally in the central task of the American Embassy in Brazil.

INTEREST OF THE INVESTOR

Let no American investor think that he has been aided by the Embassy's pressure on Brazil to surrender in the case of I.T. & T. and the American Foreign Power Co. Every other investor in Brazil will pay through the nose for the manner in which these settlements are making Brazil the laughing stock of Washington. Barron's, the major U.S. financial weekly, did well this week to call the settlement on behalf of I.T. & T. a "sham settlement which will scarcely deceive the U.S. Congress. Members of which will know that ultimately the American taxpayer will pay the compensation, since the country is bankrupt."

The surrender of Brazil to Embassy pressure on behalf of the two companies means ultimately less developmental assistance for Brazil and it means ultimately vastly increased pressure upon every American legitimate investor remaining in Brazil.

FURTADO'S CALCULATIONS ON EXCHANGE EARNINGS

We are not offering you a detailed analysis this week of the Furtado plan for Brazilian development. But we do want to make one comment on a section that has apparently aroused some skepticism. Furtado believes that Brazilian exports can total \$4.3 billion in the 3 years 1963-65. And this has been immediately greeted as "unrealistic." We believe there is every reason to anticipate, having regard for coffee prospects price and volumewise over this period, that Brazil can exceed and will exceed this figure substantially, unless undervaluation of exports for reasons of flight of capital is permitted to expand from its present very sizable magnitude.

Again, in the case of imports, Brazilian minimum essential requirements could be compacted even more without reaching the degree of stagnation which the IMF achieved in Argentina and Chile.

There is some weakness and unrealism in the Furtado aspirations, but the export section is not the place to pick on.

INVESTMENT GUARANTEES: ARGENTINA

Agency for International Development reported last week that in the fourth quarter of 1962 it issued investment guarantees for \$32.1 million of investments in Argentina.

This brings the total guarantees for investments in Argentina to \$165 million.

| | (Millions of dollars) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Cabot Corp. | 10.4 |
| Eaton Mfg. Co. | 6.4 |
| International Packers | 13.0 |
| Ramsey Corp. | 0.5 |
| Thompson Ramo Woolridge | 1.8 |

In previous quarters, guarantees had been issued as follows: American Motors \$13 million; Ford Motor Co. \$69.2 million, PASA \$50 million.

TRACTOR BUSINESS IN ARGENTINA

Klockner-Humboldt-Deutz Agencies reports that in the year 1961-62 its associated company in Buenos Aires, Deutz-Cantabrica S.A. had a "satisfactory year." Its tractor output "rose according to plan and turnover increase from \$11 to \$17 million, and a further increase in both production and turnover have been registered during the first few months of the present year." In Brazil, its Otto Deutz S.A. has raised its production of engines on schedule and its Demisa S.A. "continued with its preparations for the production of tractors and the first units were delivered in November 1961."

Agar, Cross & Co., has reported about its ACSA Agar Cross Tractors y Maquinaria Agricola S.A. that "the deteriorating conditions in Argentina have led to a radical reduction in the immediate profit expectations of ACSA. The local manufacture by John Deere of a medium-size tractor is expected to make up some of the lost ground later."

NEW FRONTIER NOTE

Dr. Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica and the most influential Latin American ever to advise on U.S. policy, will be a visiting professor of government at Harvard University for the fall term of 1963-64.

IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY

Here is a table of some interest showing relationship of military budget to gross domestic product and to gross domestic fixed capital formation: Base period is 1957-59.

| | Military budget as percentage of— | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Gross product | Fixed capital formation |
| Argentina | 2.4 | 13.0 |
| Brazil | 2.8 | 22.4 |
| Chile | 2.6 | 25.6 |
| Colombia | 1.4 | 8.8 |
| Mexico | .8 | 5.3 |
| United States | 9.8 | 58.3 |

HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,
Box 181, Benjamin Franklin Station,
Washington 4, D.C.

[From Time magazine]

THE AMERICAS: ALLIANCE IN DANGER

In conceiving of the Alliance for Progress as a bold 10-year program to develop Latin America, planners counted on massive U.S. Government aid—but also on at least \$300 million a year in direct U.S. private investment. Instead of plunging in, U.S. investors are pulling out of Latin America; in the first 9 months of 1962 brought home \$37 million more than they invested. From three sources last week came ringing indictments of the Alliance and its failure to generate any enthusiasm among businessmen.

PROFITS LOW, RISKS HIGH

The first indictment came from the 26-man Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP) appointed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to make a businesslike appraisal of the program. Reported COMAP's Chairman J. Peter Grace, 49, international-minded president of W. R.

Grace & Co.: the Alliance "in its present size and form cannot succeed." Investors are frightened away by the "unfavorable business climate" in Latin America. Profits are low, risks high. The United States, continued Grace, should adopt a "carrot and stick approach," with grants and loans to encourage Latin Americans to enact laws more hospitable to private investment. The committee recommended greater tax incentives and deductions as a cushion against heavy losses. Even then, concluded Grace, "it is unlikely that normal conditions attractive to foreign capital can be created for a number of years."

In a separate opinion—later endorsed by Grace—David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and two other COMAP members argued that the incentives and grants are only "stopgap" remedies. In the long run, "encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance." The United States, says the Rockefeller group, "should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate, and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated."

NO JOINT EFFORT

Still a third powerful criticism came from the Harvard study group of businessmen and intellectuals who in 1960 sounded the original call for a hemispherewide "alliance of progress." The study group complained that the Alliance "is not an alliance. It has lapsed into a unilateral U.S. checkwriting program." The solution, said the group, is for Latin Americans, like Europeans during Marshall plan days, to join in a regional organization to establish priorities for spending aid money.

In 18 months the United States has committed \$1.6 billion to the Alliance. But the results so far, as COMAP's Grace says, indicate only that "we are in great danger of suffering a major defeat to our strategic interests in this hemisphere."

HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,

Washington, March 23, 1963.

DEAR SIR: This week the Senate Appropriations Committee issued a report on the Alliance for Progress prepared by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. HUMPHREY is rapidly outdistancing Senator MORSE as the liberals' spokesman on Latin American policy, and already leads MORSE in the support of policy positions that are causing the collapse of U.S. relations with Latin America. Two points in the new report merit consideration by the business community:

MORE EXPROPRIATIONS

(1) HUMPHREY predicts that the trend to expropriate public utilities and firms in the extractive industries will continue, and he approves the method adopted by the State Department in the American Foreign Power Co. case, wherein the U.S. Treasury is to provide the compensation for the company by means of concealed donations to the Brazilian Government, which are deducted from amounts that would otherwise be made available to Brazil for constructive purposes.

ALLENDE VIEW SUPPORTED

In effect, HUMPHREY accepts the view of Presidential Candidate Allende in Chile that "since Cuba, the United States can no longer impose its will in the matter of expropriations." Allende points out that he "does not any longer anticipate any bitter dispute over expropriation" and he promises upon election to take over the American copper companies. Compensation would be for value of non-depreciated capital and since Chile is on the dole, the funds would come from the U.S. Treasury, that is, from the U.S. taxpayer. Again, the amounts thus awarded to American companies by the U.S. Treasury would be

deducted from funds that might otherwise under the Alliance have gone to Chile for constructive purposes.

In the case of Chile, the effect of the Humphrey-Allende thesis is to make it impossible for any candidate in the election to refrain from expropriation of the American companies.

DEFEATS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Two qualifications must be made immediately to the HUMPHREY thesis: First, the device is wholly improper as a subsidy by the U.S. taxpayer to selected stockholders in selected companies. And it is economically unsound and actually destructive of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress because it constitutes simply a substitution of public foreign for private foreign capital rather than meeting the deficiency in capital which is a prominent barrier to economic growth and social reform. This escapes Senator HUMPHREY completely.

NO FUNDS FOR COMPENSATION

The second qualification is a very practical matter: When HUMPHREY expresses his confidence that "the trend toward local ownership of utilities and extractive industries is likely to continue," he forgets the statistics of the problem. There is not now in the President's budget and there is not in the budget that the Congress is likely to approve anything like the magnitudes needed to pay off the owners of the utilities and the extractive industries in Latin America.

This accounts for the haste of some members of COMAP to demand a rise to \$2.5 billion per year for the Alliance for Progress, lest the Treasury run out of money to pay for their particular foreign investments. What is important and what is not at all debatable is that such financing in such magnitudes is not going to be available.

We have, then, the evolution of the perfect device to destroy the objectives of the Alliance for Progress as far as Latin America is concerned, and also to accelerate confiscation without compensation as far as the bulk of U.S. investors is concerned.

DOOMING THE ALLIANCE

For HUMPHREY, the inconsistency in advocating the objectives of the Alliance and simultaneously supporting steps that will prevent economic growth and democratically achieved social reform is not at all unique. When, for instance, there occurred the Bolivian expropriations which touched off the present era of confiscation cum approval of the U.S. Treasury, HUMPHREY rejected the accepted dictates of international law, enthused at the challenge to the owners of the tin mines, and even wondered how they had avoided even worse punishment so long for their alleged errors of judgment and policy.

Yet now, a decade later, \$250 million later in U.S. donations, with the confiscated properties a shambles, HUMPHREY does not oppose paying the owners of the Patino properties out of the U.S. Treasury and indeed he supports their desire for higher prices for minerals from their mines in other countries, even though it involves serious damage to U.S. balance of payments by preventing the orderly movement of suitable magnitudes of U.S. stockpiled minerals at a time when supply-demand conditions warrant such movement.

HUMPHREY has also failed to protest the millions of dollars committed from U.S. loan funds to service the defaulted Bolivian dollar bonds which have been the object of criticism since FDR sounded off on the Bolivian issues. He apparently considers this a proper use of taxpayers' funds perhaps on the theory that even speculators in defaulted bonds have one vote each.

THE FRUITS OF NATIONALIZING

The U.S. Government has reported after a year of the triangular operation to rehabilitate Comibol that the losses of the nation-

alized venture in 1962 mounted to \$11.5 million, from \$10 million in 1961. This makes a total of \$33 million in losses of the venture in 3 years, to say nothing of the enormous losses of previous years, all of which have been paid for by the U.S. taxpayer. On March 16, 1962, the House Appropriations Committee was told that a 3 year program would put Comibol onto a profitmaking basis, and would total "something like \$35 million." It was told that the first year's burden would be \$16 million. On February 28, 1963, the Embassy reported that the first year program had run \$22.8 million, that the second year would run \$20.5 million and that the total would go well over \$50 million.

The promise now is that the Comibol venture will become a profitmaker by 1964 early, but only if the United States promises to fix a price for tin, by the manipulation of its tin holdings, that will permit immense and excessive profits for all other producers of tin in the world over, among whom would be the interests whom HUMPHREY once criticized and now is willing to have subsidized.

COMPETITION?

Meanwhile, Bolivia's Minister for Peasant Affairs, who had already denounced the U.S. purpose and execution in the Alliance for Progress, told the press in London that the U.S. aid was embarrassing to the Bolivian regime and that Bolivia and other Latin American nations were turning to Europe for aid in order to avoid too great a dependence on the United States. Nothing could please the U.S. taxpayer more than to be rid of the Bolivian burden and it is all too unfortunate that no European nation has risen to the call. (The German participation in the triangular operation merely consists of credits for exports underwritten and guaranteed by U.S. donations. In that sense, they are counter to the U.S. policy of promoting U.S. exports.)

THE COST OF EMOTIONAL HOSTILITY

(2) Senator HUMPHREY's second policy-finding or discovery was that "If our relationships with Brazil deteriorate to the point of emotional hostility, then whatever we seek to do in the Western Hemisphere will be endangered." It must be clear that direct intervention in the internal affairs of any Latin American country is the simplest way to create emotional hostility. Yet, in his curious inconsistency, HUMPHREY himself intervened in the Peruvian election with advice calculated to arouse hostility on the part of any independent minded Latin American. And he was curiously quiet when the State Department in an adventure of characteristic clumsiness last week staged the fiasco in Brazil:

Was this sequence calculated to prevent or to stimulate deterioration of our relations with Brazil to the point of emotional hostility?

(1) On the eve of the visit of the Brazilian Finance Minister, favored press leaks of the White House were given a briefing on the extent of Communist infiltration in the Goulart regime. Their published accounts follow closely the testimony of the American Ambassador before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

(2) Although the State Department had full authority and opportunity to edit out or delay publication of any testimony the ambassador had given before the committee, it permitted publication during the visit of the finance minister of the charges of Communist infiltration.

(3) When even pro-U.S. newspapers in Brazil reacted by suggesting that it might be advisable not to allow Ambassador Gordon to return, the Department sought to "manage the news" by stating that the State Department and not the Ambassador had given the hostile testimony.

(4) A few hours after this attempt to manage the news failed, the Department said that the Ambassador and the Department held the same views.

(5) A day later, both the wire services and the Washington Post were attributing the statement to the Ambassador and not to the Department.

Emotional hostility? The new policy of intervention in Latin America is calculated to stimulate emotional hostility on a scale never before seen in this hemisphere. What does Senator HUMPHREY expect to happen when the Guatemalans learn that the White House is supporting Arevalo for the presidency in Guatemala? That the same Arevalo was even linked with protests by White House favorite, Figueres, and others against Peru holding an election without outside observers?

In an exclusive interview published March 17, Assistant Secretary of State Martin said that "there are Communist sympathizers in various places in the Brazilian [Government] structure, which is a matter which creates some difficulty for us."

BASIC ELEMENT IN BRAZILIAN NEGOTIATION

The fact which both the Brazilian press and the American press failed to cope with was that the visit of the Brazilian finance minister, in the minds of Amembassy Brazil and the State Department, has only one purpose and that is to button up the deal for American Foreign Power Co. And the price that will be paid by the United States for this perversion of American foreign policy, and the price to be paid by American firms in Brazil, is yet to unfold.

U.S. INVESTMENTS

Meanwhile, the State Department reported to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that in the first 9 months of 1962, American firms invested in Brazil at a pace almost 3 times as great as in the full year 1961. The pace was \$2 million a month, compared with \$0.7 million in 1961.

U.S. direct investments—9 months, 1960

| | (Millions of dollars) |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Argentina | 77 |
| Brazil | 18 |
| Colombia | 18 |
| Mexico | 14 |
| Venezuela (withdrew) | 191 |
| Chile (withdrew) | 7 |
| Panama (withdrew) | 21 |
| Guatemala (withdrew) | 2 |

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

The State Department also reported last week that Brazil's gross national product had increased by 3.5 percent in 1962 while Argentina's gross national product decreased by 6 percent. It reported that Bolivia's gross national product increased by 5 percent, but the Embassy qualified this to point out that virtually all of the increase was made up of the increase in donations from Washington.

HUMPHREY'S OTHER VIEWS: OIL, ETC.

We have ignored some other recommendations of Senator HUMPHREY for obvious reasons. He is, for instance, disturbed at Brazil's purchase of Middle East oil and seems to be getting close in his thinking to hemisphere preferentials which would be a step backward in the administration's effort at freer world trade. Again, he is unhappy that U.S. firms with plants in Latin America and the United States have in some cases chosen to ship from the United States rather than from Latin America. Senator HUMPHREY's interest in Latin America may ultimately turn out to be a great disaster for Latin America as well as for the United States.

GOULART EVALUATION

Here is an odd note in a week in which the Communist infiltration in Brazil is a

front page story across this country. The leading U.S. socialist magazine reported that the left has no confidence whatever in the Goulart regime.

HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,
Box 181, Benjamin Franklin Station,
Washington 4, D.C.

HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,
Washington, March 30, 1963.

DEAR SIR: The U.S. Government reported this week that assistance to Latin America in the calendar year 1962 had been reduced by \$170 million, as compared with calendar year 1961. It reported further that at the end of the year, the annual pace was running less than \$600 million per year, as compared with \$677 million in 1962 and \$848 million in 1961. Again, whereas outright grants had constituted only 17 percent of assistance in 1961, they constituted 26 percent of assistance in 1962. It should immediately be noted also that a large proportion of the so-called credit assistance is merely in the form of concealed grants so that the proportion of donations is actually larger than these figures indicate.

U.S. relations with Latin America [In millions of dollars]

| | 1961 | 1962 |
|--|------|------|
| Net Government credit aid including concealed grants | 701 | 501 |
| Outright donations | 147 | 176 |
| Capital outflow to private direct investments | 141 | -18 |
| Earnings remitted by direct investors | 711 | 756 |

In addition to the reduction in assistance obtained from the U.S. Government, Latin America suffered a deterioration of \$159 million in the matter of direct investments. For the calendar year 1962, U.S. companies reduced their investment by withdrawing \$18 million net, whereas in 1961 they had increased their investments by sending down another \$141 million.

At the same time, earnings remitted from Latin America were increasing substantially from \$711 to \$756 million. (In 1960, \$641 million was remitted.)

All assistance data cited here refer to assistance actually rendered rather than to commitments entered into.

THE BRAZILIAN DEAL: BLACKMAIL

Some weeks ago, the Director of Studies of the Royal Institute of International Affairs warned that unless the West "is prepared to accept the risk of accident, namely, that some country may go Communist, the donor countries will be chronically vulnerable to blackmail from the least competent and most oppressive governments of the underdeveloped world." With official evidence published of Communist infiltration in Brazil, there was no effort in Washington this week to conceal the fact that the plan of financial aid represents precisely such a response to demands for blackmail. As an associate of the White House wrote: "The policy decision to negotiate the substantial loan (sic) is based largely upon the fact (sic) that no political alternative to President Goulart exists presently on the scene." The idea that there is an absence of a political alternative would be challenged vigorously by the pro-West political forces in Brazil who oppose Goulart.

THE BRAZILIAN DEAL: THE CRUZEIRO

You will recall that in May 1961, when the administration was seeking to maximize the propaganda values of the so-called billion dollar bailout for Brazil, we pointed out that the facts did not jibe too well with the propaganda, and that reservations regarding the deal were every much in order, on the part of the business community. At the present time, a more precise appraisal

of the new Brazilian deal is very much in order. What actually did Brazil get in the sense of impact on the deteriorating situation? After all, the \$70 million in Public Law 480 is merely a continuation of policies existing even as the deterioration was making itself felt, so there is nothing new in that:

(1) Brazil got \$84 million, part of it from a previous commitment to Brazil, and part of it replacing in effect an earlier \$30 million commitment made to button up the I.T. & T. compensation arrangement.

But a large part of this \$84 million is in fact mortgaged by the Brazilian commitment to provide the windfall for stockholders of American Foreign Power Co. which is extremely disadvantageous for Brazil and wholly out of order at a time like this. In other words, on the part of the United States, a large part of the assistance is in effect assistance to a particular group of U.S. stockholders which is a wholly improper use of foreign aid funds. And on the part of Brazil, the effect of the assistance is in large part nullified by the new mortgage on Brazilian legitimately earned exchange accepted thus by the Brazilian negotiators.

(2) The heart of the arrangement, then, rests with the \$200 million in concealed donations from the Agency for International Development. But immediately note well that this part of the program depends on the wishes of the Congress and will depend on fresh appropriations from the Congress. And the Congress in the foreign aid bill may well introduce stipulations limiting the flow of such funds to Brazil.

For, politically, the Congress generally considers the Goulart regime to be untrustworthy and infiltrated with Communists at very high policymaking levels. Against this position, with which the executive branch actually agrees in private, the executive branch has argued that the very weapon poised over Goulart's head of the bribe if he acts as the American Ambassador dictates will cause Goulart to shake off his Communist advisers. At this stage it remains uncertain that Goulart wants to shake them off, and if he should want to, whether he can.

But this is not simply a matter of political speculation. The economic measures contemplated by the new program envisage a substantial economic slowdown in Brazil, a sloughing off to economic and business activity such as took place in Argentina and has quite demoralized Argentina. Should this happen in Brazil, public opinion would undoubtedly attribute it to the dictates of the American Embassy and act very unsympathetically toward the political aspirations of the arrangement. Perhaps Goulart's leftist advisers count on this.

Economically, the \$200 million in concealed donations constitutes a new era in bailouts. Formerly, bailouts and balance-of-payments assistance were largely conceived on a commercial basis, i.e. as temporary assistance to tide over to corrections in the balance of payments and as such rendered in the form of repayable loans on commercial terms. This time there is the extended grace period, the lack of interest (the arrangement will cost the U.S. Treasury some \$250 million in interest payments on the money it borrows to hand Brazil), and the 40-year term.

But this does not exhaust the analysis of the concealed donations of \$200 million. U.S. officials readily concede that the \$200 million will serve to bail out European creditors of Brazil and thus actually worsen the competitive position of U.S. exporters in the Brazilian market. Secondly, a large portion will be absorbed by oil company arrearages, in a form of retroactive insurance, without cost to the companies, which has never been formally approved by the Congress as an appropriate use of foreign aid.

You will recall that in 1961 the Treasury tried to soften the impact of the gigantic gouge on the U.S. Treasury by referring to expectations that \$150 million of assistance would accompany the deal from Europe and Japan. This never materialized, and the Finance Minister revealed that only \$23 million had been obtained from Europe, and even that on hard commercial terms. The Brazilian hope is that the \$200 million in concealed donations from AID will underwrite the European credits and that thus there will be forthcoming from Europe and Japan \$23 million in repayable credits at commercial interest rates in addition to the \$77 million previously withheld. That is, that the Europeans will accept export business when it is underwritten and in effect financed by U.S. donations.

Again, the reaction of the Congress to this arrangement, economically, may well be as hostile as it is to the arrangement on political grounds.

THE SETTING OF THE BRAZILIAN DEAL

Meanwhile, it would be well for every business firm to remember the setting of the present arrangement in the historic words of the Finance Minister which have been published in so many major U.S. newspapers this week. "Foreign aid should be considered as a means of indemnity for damages caused by the exploitative process." The "exploiting" being a reference to the activities of foreign capital.

In a sense that is a more meaningful indicator of the setting of the U.S. relationship with Brazil currently than the whistling which one finds in the report to stockholders of Caterpillar Tractor Co.: "Business in Brazil continues to be fraught with the risks usually associated with rapid inflation in wages and prices, very substantial deficits in the national budget, unfavorable terms of trade, deficits on balance of payments, and general political instability." Caterpillar Brazil however has demonstrated that it is possible to conduct a business with a reasonable measure of success under these conditions. It has been able to protect itself so far against major loss as a result of foreign exchange devaluation, and to employ retained cruzeiro earnings for worthwhile expansion of the business. For this reason and with continuing faith that Brazil could become a very substantial market for its products, Caterpillar is undertaking further investment in and identification with that country."

MAXWELL HOUSE DRAWS FIRST BLOOD FROM COFFEE AGREEMENT

On March 20, Maxwell House announced increases in the price of coffee, effective March 22. It said that "the steady rise of green coffee prices over the last 5 months" made the increases necessary. The cost to the consumer of the price changes led by Maxwell House is put at \$60 to \$100 million per year. Inventory profits for the industry are put at \$16 to \$20 million.

Immediately, agencies of the U.S. Government noted that the allegations of green coffee price increases necessitating the price rise do not appear to be well founded. And they released official indexes of the movement of coffee prices as follows:

Indexes of prices

| | Wholesale price, Colombian coffee | Wholesale price, Brazilian coffee | Retail price in United States |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| February 1963 | 73.1 | 70.4 | 77.1 |
| January 1963 | 74.0 | 71.0 | 77.2 |
| December 1962 | 74.0 | 71.0 | 77.1 |
| July 1962 | 74.0 | 72.6 | 79.2 |
| January 1962 | 79.1 | 72.0 | 79.3 |

And the Department of Commerce reported that the trend of coffee import prices from

September through January 1963 (latest data available) has been downward. This was true for total coffee imports, as well as for Colombian and Brazilian imports.

It must be clear that the timing of the price rise on the eve of effective date for the International Coffee Agreement is suggestive in the extreme. If the path or procedure for price increases by the coffee countries under the price fixing mechanism to be run by the U.S. representative is thus being established, it is time that the Congress demanded an official investigation, regardless of the status of the International Coffee Agreement. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee failed dismally to hold proper and appropriate hearings on the coffee agreement, and if there is to be any protection for the consumer at all, and for the U.S. balance of payments, some agency of the Government must be brought in to hold hearings on the fixing of coffee prices in this country.

It will be recalled that during the hearings on the coffee agreement, with no doubts by anyone connected with the committee that prices were going to be raised, the National Coffee Association plausibly testified that "the responsibilities of our members as U.S. citizens transcend their personal interests. We are willing to make sacrifices." The first "sacrifice" contemplated was perhaps acceptance of the \$60 million in inventory profits which is envisaged by the position taken by leading Latin American advisers to the administration as to the level at which coffee prices should be fixed.

The chairman of General Foods Corp. (Maxwell House) on March 27 said that he saw "signs of broader public understanding of the economic facts of life." It is time that public understanding made itself felt in the matter of coffee prices. It would appear as it did during the rape of the consumer in the two previous great upward movements of prices in the past 15 years that the coffee industry still relies on the inability of the consumer to make his voice heard.

HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER

Washington, D.C.

P.S.—Communist propagandists have found very useful for their purposes in Latin America a press release put out by the World Coffee Information Center alleging that the Central American countries suffered losses of \$593 million since 1957 because of the drop in coffee prices. This thesis of losses has, of course, been totally rejected both by analysts of the U.S. Government, by the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil in a major address, and by one of the most prominent Latin American economists with an international reputation. It might be well for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine into the fountains of propaganda in the course of its current investigation of foreign agents and foreign propaganda in this country. The World Coffee Information Center is the information branch of the International Coffee Agreement.

P.S.—Here is Senator HUMPHREY's evaluation of the State Department's handling of the testimony on Communist infiltration in Brazil: "rather amateurish, unprecedented and unwarranted handling of very difficult and sensitive relationships between our country and Brazil."

BRAZIL—THE TOTTERING KEYSTONE

WASHINGTON, February 25, 1963.—"If the Alliance for Progress goes into operation fully, if reforms, social, economic, and political, are put into effect, then communism and Castroism will collapse in South America. However, if effort is not made and reforms are not forthcoming, we will have problems in South America even if there is no Cuba or Castro" (Robert Kennedy, interview in U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 28, 1963).

The above quotation from the Attorney General typifies the broad feeling within the U.S. Government that communism in Latin America is exclusively a product of economic and social discontent. According to this view, communism can be tolerated in Cuba because it is irrelevant to the final outcome of the Communist challenge in the Western Hemisphere. All will depend, in this view, on the success or failure of the Alliance for Progress.

Others feel, however, that the political warfare being waged by the Communists is far more important than social and economic discontent. For example, a little known drama is taking place which could, in a matter of months, render the entire Alliance for Progress irrelevant. This is the developing struggle for power in Brazil. If the pro-Communist and leftist forces should win, the largest and most powerful state in Latin America might soon be lost to the free world. With this keystone gone, nothing could prevent the loss of the entire continent. The issue may hinge on the political attitude of the United States toward the contending factions.

The Brazilian situation became critical after President Quadros resigned in August 1961. A civil war was nearly fought in Brazil after a number of military leaders attempted to prevent Vice President Goulart from taking power on his return from a visit to Communist China. While regarded in some circles as a mere opportunist, Goulart was and is deeply suspected by many others as a doctrinaire leftist who is opening the way toward a Communist takeover of Brazil.

The facts lean heavily toward this evaluation. The 1961 crisis was solved by a compromise which limited the presidential powers in favor of a "parliamentary" form of government. Economic and political chaos followed as Goulart set out to reacquire full power by proving the parliamentary system unworkable. He surrounded himself with pro-Communist or "neutralist" advisers, restored amicable relations with the Soviet Union, maintained friendly relations with Cuba (Brazil abstained on the Punta del Este resolution which barely got the two-thirds vote necessary to expel Cuba from the Organization of American States), and began to build his support within the all-important armed forces.

Last September the struggle between Goulart and the conservative-oriented Brazilian Congress came to a head over the question of a plebiscite to restore the full power of the President. Communist-infiltrated labor unions staged pro-Goulart strikes and riots. Pro-Goulart military commanders threatened a coup. Congress gave in and agreed to the plebiscite, which was held on January 6, 1963. The issue was not Goulart as such, but the form of government. With inflation mounting and matters generally going from bad to worse, Goulart shrewdly worded the question as "yes" or "no" to the existing parliamentary system. Brazilians voted 5 to 1 against it, and the new Brazilian Congress must now restore the full presidential system. Goulart has thus thrown off the shackles placed on him in 1961.

No one can know Goulart's innermost motivation. He says he has no intention of permitting a Communist Brazil, but the moderates who hoped he would rid himself of the Communists surrounding him and reverse the leftist trend have been disappointed. Goulart is moving to consolidate his power, crush his opposition, and make himself a dictator—already the Brazilian free press is virtually destroyed. There is still a chance that he can be blocked or overthrown before his victory is complete, but it will probably require unconstitutional means. The U.S. attitude could be critical to the success or failure of such an effort.

The lineup of forces now looks like this: Ranged on Goulart's side are many of the

labor unions (two out of five of the labor confederations are controlled by Communists); the National Union of Students; Castro admirer Francisco Juliao, leader of the "peasant leagues" of impoverished northeastern Brazil (it has been announced that he will visit Cuba at Castro's invitation); some anti-U.S. Army officers; and of course Goulart's brother-in-law, Leonel Brizola, Governor of the State of Rio Grande Do Sul. It was Brizola who confiscated the southern Brazilian subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph in February 1962. He traces all of Brazil's problems to "the occupation of our nation by the United States," and recently booted a U.S. Peace Corps group out of his state.

Against Goulart are most of the senior military officers, much of the business community, the National Democratic Union (UDN) political party, and the middle classes which have been suffering so heavily under the runaway inflation. Also strongly anti-Goulart, and high on the Communist target list, is Carlos Lacerda, stanchly anti-Communist Governor of Guanabara State (which includes Rio de Janeiro). Early last year he warned Brazilians of the rise to power to Communists among Goulart's advisers. More recently, he declared on television that "It seems that the plan of the men in power is to hand Brazil over to Soviet Russia, with U.S. money, thus betraying the trust of the people who voted in the farcical January 6 plebiscite."

How much truth is there in this charge? There is ample reason, certainly to fear the rise of communism under a Goulart dictatorship even if he is not personally another Fidel Castro. If the Communists fail to take over the country from the top, there is always the chance that they will do so by revolution from below if there is not a strong anti-Communist leadership to oppose them. Brazil is a primary object of Cuban-originated subversion. Planeloads of Brazilians are taken to Havana on all-expense trips. Brazilian students are offered free scholarships provided they also take guerrilla-warfare training at Cuban universities.

Last November Cuban Raul Cepero Bonilla was killed in an air crash in Peru. Documents were found in his briefcase which were turned over to Brazil and never made public. The documents consisted of a report to his superior by a Cuban agent on the status of various guerrilla training camps in six Brazilian States, particularly in Goias. These camps were financed by Cuban money and were under overall Cuban military direction. To be sure, many problems were being encountered in organization and personnel. One problem concerned the fact that the location and purpose of the training camps was becoming obvious to too many people, including the police. But the police were doing little or nothing to crack down on the revolutionaries.

Such apathy by the Government bodes ill for the future. The Brazilian Communist Party itself is small, with an estimated 50,000 members, but its power is widespread. One of the two labor federations controlled by the party is that of the industrial workers with 5 million members. In the city of Rio alone, the Communists now control the metalworkers, bank clerks, tailors, textile workers, stevedores, teamsters and electrical workers. Party leaders in Sao Paulo were elated last October when all five politicians who had official Communist Party support were elected to office.

Under Goulart's policies of improved economic and political relations with the Soviet bloc (trade is to be increased substantially to lessen economic dependence on the United States), and the general tide of anti-American statements by demagogic politicians (and even some businessmen), the climate for communism is steadily improving. And now it appears that Goulart will get his money

from the United States. Prodded by a quick trip of Robert Kennedy to Brazil last December—which reportedly produced a stormy interview—Goulart agreed to a tentative compensation plan for I.T. & T. and announced an austerity program to put Brazil's financial house in order. The United States promptly granted a short-term credit of \$30 million. More will undoubtedly follow.

But, if the political situation is not changed, we may be pouring money into a future Communist state. Such a change could come soon by means of a military coup against Goulart. A good indication of the attitude in the military showed up recently when Governor Brizola and several other prominent leftists were awarded the naval merit medal. In the following weeks, 33 admirals and other officers turned back to the government their own merit medals.

Matters are building to a climax in which the U.S. attitude may be crucial. If they are to act at all, senior military leaders will have to act quickly, and they will probably need at least the tacit approval of the United States.

Goulart's plan is evidently to ease out officers opposed to him and replace them with his own men. In July 1963 many generals are due for retirement and the way will be open for the promotion of pro-Goulart colonels to general rank. A key indicator to Goulart's strategy may be the appointment of the leftist first army commander Gen. Osvino Alves, as Minister of War. This would alienate almost the entire general officer corps as well as the moderate and center political forces. If the appointment is made, it will be because Goulart feels strong enough to neutralize his military opposition.

This time, the U.S. Government is at least genuinely concerned with the developing situation in Brazil. The question is what to do. Do we steadfastly uphold "democratic" procedures which may be paving the way toward a very undemocratic accession to power of communism in Brazil—which will seal the doom of all Latin America; or do we encourage the only elements which may yet be able to stop the dangerous drift toward disaster? It is an old choice with which we seem congenitally unable to cope. In a world in which no government is perfect, we all too often sacrifice the substance of democracy in order to preserve or promote its form. In the end, both may be lost.

FRANK J. JOHNSON,
Editor.

SLIDE RULE FAILURE IN BRAZIL

(By Keith Botsford)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—After an eventful week in Brazilian-American relations—during which the President was believed to have ordered the recall of his Finance Minister and the suspension of negotiations with the United States; the Nationalist bloc in Congress was hunting for Ambassador Lincoln Gordon's head, or at least his credentials; and the Salguero sambistas held a silent parade of protest—all is now sweetness and light. The State Department, most sensibly, has assuaged Brazilian pride; the Washington Post has come out for Brazil; and Joao Goulart is trying to muzzle his brother-in-law, Leonel Brizola.

This typical profile of a Brazilian crisis—gloom and optimism, confusion, doubt and euphoria—began in a U.S. House subcommittee, where testimony had been taken to the effect that Communists had infiltrated Brazilian society and even branches of its Government. Now it is not exactly news that Brazilian Communists, thanks to the apathy and division of their opponents, are able to control the student movement or many of the unions with a tiny minority of activists. Nor is it surprising to learn that the armed forces of Brazil have been undergoing a process of renovation along Goulart-Labor Party-Nationalist lines. After

all, the President's power has been challenged ever since he took office; he has always needed to find support. Likewise, no one denies that there are several Communists or useful fools in Goulart's immediate entourage. His press secretary, Raul Ryff, who was probably responsible for the fictitious breaking off of the talks in Washington, is an avowed and active Communist.

This is but a small part of the trouble, however. A proper panorama of the Brazilian situation cannot leave out dissension within the armed forces over promotions and pay; the navy's smuggling past Federal Customs planes with which to fit out its phantom aircraft carrier; and a crime wave in Rio which revealed that there are twice as many convicted criminals walking the streets as there are in the prisons. A continuing inflation, a sag in productivity and an enormous accumulated debt indicate that twice as much money is needed as is in the bank. To the public this means restricted credit, prices out of reach and development at a standstill: or, to make it clearer, no new car or TV, less food, and dipping into savings.

Until very recently, the Brazilian Government solved its economic problems by printing new money. Now the tendency is to plans. There is to be an anti-inflationary plan and a 3-year plan; Government expenses are to be cut nearly in half. Whether this resolves the problem is a matter of conjecture. Federal outlay in some fields, particularly education, is disastrously low; the great bulk of the deficit is due to an inflated bureaucracy. Recently I was privileged to observe that it took 21 employes 2½ hours to clear a package through customs. This labor netted 65 cents for the Federal Government, in itself an unusual amount, since the more general practice is to pay one of the employees and pay the Government nothing.

A thread runs through these apparently disparate reflections: the shapelessness of Brazilian society. It is simply impossible to judge this country according to European or North American standards. Everything here works by tangents and approximations. Subcommittees of the U.S. House of Representatives, with their slide rules and multiplication tables (x number of Communists equals subversion), are far out of the picture.

In defending its interests, the first thing the United States ought to know is who its real enemies are. The Communists in Brazil are few and infinitely less dangerous in the long run than the kind of wordy opportunists who have, in fact, taken up strong positions in the present administration. Professional Communists can be left to the Brazilians. But who is going to cover the great Brazilian blindspot, the incompetent get-ahead intellectual masquerading as a patriot?

If the subcommittee had had a potted biography of each so-called Communist, it would probably have approved of the type: corporation lawyers, journalists, professors, industrialists, and, in the northeast, overseers for the great fazendeiros. These men are radicals, nationalists, or what-have-you simply because they believe this will give them position, power, prestige, and money. Meanwhile, the center is firmly occupied by ripe old senatorial types with long locks and fine speeches—the traditional parties and the traditional elites.

Where is a young man to go? Latin American intellectuals are more prone than most to take the path of least resistance. If a few speeches, a badly written pamphlet, and a couple of heroic attitudes will obtain a department or a ministry or a reputation at the least, why waste time on honest work? The facility with which the young rise in Latin America is a symbol of intellectual corruption.

It has, for instance, cost Francisco San Tiago Dantas, the present Minister of Fi-

nance, no inner debate to alter his political position from that of the "brain" of the integralist dictatorship of Getulio Vargas to that of the theoretician of a sovereign Brazil: The two are not really so very different. But, at the same time, it bothers him little to follow a nationalist line when it suits him and yet continue his legal practice for the North American corporations his colleagues denounce.

Similarly, whenever Jango Goulart has met too much resistance to his tactics, when he has understood that he has gone too far, he has simply backtracked temporarily and reassured the country, which really profoundly dislikes radicalism of any kind. No assurance, however, is provided that after Brazil has been lulled, the cycle will not begin again.

On the other hand, no country today can demand of another unwavering support of its own foreign policy. Brazil, like Ghana or Burma, wants a policy of its own; indeed, often the policy's only justification is its independence. Nevertheless, it is time the United States recognized that Brazilian society is based on democratic principles. When North American demands do not violate or threaten Brazil's economy, its social structure or its longstanding political commitments (whatever the United States may think of these), the two countries will generally be in agreement. In the cold war, this agreement is a matter of where the United States lays its emphases, and how much it insists on areas of disagreement.

If Brazilian loyalty to the free world rests on taking up a firm position on the Cuban question, the United States is only providing ammunition for the nationalists, who see the U.S. challenge to Cuba not in terms of freedom and justice, but as a desire on the part of Washington to reaffirm its control over the island. In North American insistence on the "menace" of Cuba, they see only an irrational obsession with communism. As the United States has never stated what alternatives it backs, what people, what platforms, or what it will do about Cuban land reform, the expropriated companies, or the emigration, Brazilians, like Mexicans and many other Latin Americans, presume the worst. And the worst has a tangible form—the status quo ante represented by the doubts of Miami.

Finally, U.S. insistence on internal "reform" verges on the impossible. The Brazilian Government constantly promises reforms—they now go by the name of "basic" reforms, in keeping with the new jargon—but the idea of reform remains more important than the practice. Reforms in Brazil are power plays, like everything else. They call forth predictable reactions from some sections of the voting public, which is what they are for.

Change and reform are by their nature slow processes. The one way to make sure they will not work is to put them in abstract, generalized terms and to prefer the vast, global plan to any kind of modest beginning. Words are the escape valve of progress. On this score, it is hard to see how the United States, which from the beginning has conceived of the Alliance for Progress in the vastest possible terms, and as a great "slogan" to prove its interest in Latin America, can criticize Brazil when it, too, thinks in terms of "bigness" and reforms that remain words. Nor is it easy to be told to put one's house in order when one of the advisers of the Alliance is Juscelino Kubitschek, who by ambition and greed, started the whole inflationary spiral in Brazil.

Failing the example of small successes that the "people" can see and benefit from, and put pressure on the Government to emulate, the result is likely to be big failures. Instead of trying to "solve" the problem of the Northeast, which may well be insoluble, why not make tangible progress—which is quite

possible—on other problems, equally or more desperate? In many parts of Brazil, small, almost insignificant projects have gained public support and materially benefited the "people." Each of these is a resounding blow against the mainstream of empty talk that flows about the Brazilian "left"; and each is a proof that the United States need not preach "revolution."

"Revolution" is not a very safe word if you cannot provide the goods, and modesty in demands and plans—things that can be achieved—is always preferable to ambitious dreams that fail. Starting from this axiom, it should not be hard to see how Brazil can be linked to its sister-democracy, the United States. It cannot be done by ramming a Cuban position down its throat or by conjuring up menaces that do not exist and bypassing the very real dangers that abound.

MISCELLANEOUS STATEMENTS

On February 2, 1963, the chairman of the Commerce Department's Committee for the Alliance for Progress, J. Peter Grace, stated: "The program, in its present size and form, cannot succeed and we are in great danger of suffering a major defeat to our strategic interests in this hemisphere.

"The amount of aid which it proposed to provide is grossly inadequate and the manner in which the aid is to be made available, mainly on a Government to Government basis, raises extreme doubt as to the effectiveness of any amount of aid in attaining our objective."

In a news conference on March 18, 1963, in Mexico City, former Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek held that he found throughout the continent of Latin America "an absolute lack of faith in the Alliance and its results among the popular classes."

Labor leaders from 11 Latin American countries meeting in Mexico City for their third annual meeting sponsored by the Inter-American Regional Labor Organization, asserted that workers are not getting the benefits they expected from the Alliance for Progress program.

Delegates from Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay, and Honduras issued a statement saying, "the working class has been completely disregarded in the plans of the Alliance."

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 10 1963]

ALLIANCE IS RAPPED

NEW ORLEANS, April 10.—Top news executives of Latin America and the United States wind up a 3-day clinic today at the second annual Pan American press seminar.

A Chilean newspaper executive said yesterday the Alliance for Progress is dying in Latin America.

Raul Silva Castro, editor of *El Mercurio* in Santiago, questioned the fact that under the Alliance "underdeveloped countries must raise taxes to the same level as that in the United States" and predicted the Alliance will fall of its own weight.

Earlier, Señor Silva Castro had objected to a Bolivian editor's remarks about the free trade zone in South America.

Hugo Gonzalez Rioja, editor of *La Nacion* in La Paz, Bolivia, blamed the lack of television in his country on the fact "we are not allowed to participate in the free trade zone of South America." He added that Bolivia is underdeveloped and will remain so until it is allowed to participate in the free trade zone.

Señor Silva Castro jumped to his feet, pounded the table, and shouted, "No, no. It's a lie."

Joseph L. Jones, vice president and general foreign manager of United Press International, said the primary reason for the Alliance for Progress not developing to fullest

expectations was that Latin American private investors are not investing as they should.

Vicente Machado Valle, of *El Dia* in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, praised the Peace Corps for reaching the rural people, but he said for many the Alliance for Progress was only "the change of the tax system."

[From the New York Journal-American, Oct. 6, 1962]

ALLIANCE CHIEF EGGED

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA, October 6.—Teodoro Moscoso, Alliance for Progress coordinator, and his party were hit by eggs hurled by six youths yesterday at a housing project being built with Alliance funds.

Shouting anti-American slogans, the youths let fly with eggs and rocks when the party emerged from inspecting a house in a Bogotá suburb. One egg hit Mr. Moscoso on the back of the head.

Five of the youths fled, but residents caught the sixth and beat him before police arrived.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, to liberty-loving and independent Poles their Constitution of 1791 is almost as important as their political independence. They have always attached extraordinary significance to this historic document because they felt, and still feel, that by the implementation of its liberal, sweeping provisions they were to be freed from the shackles and obstructive intricacies of their old, unwieldy, and inefficient regime. With that worthy goal in mind their leaders framed, adopted, and promulgated that Constitution, which by its democratic and progressive provisions was considered a moderate and model charter for the Poles.

The Constitution drastically limited the powers of the King and made Poland a constitutional monarchy. Responsible cabinet form of government was established; the old system of class distinctions was eliminated. The upper legislative chamber lost some of its powers, and the second chamber was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers existing between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were practically obliterated, and the peasantry was taken under the protection of the law. In many ways the Constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries. Its promulgation was hailed not only by the Poles, but it was also acclaimed by liberals in other countries.

Unfortunately, the Poles were not given the chance to test the efficacy of this Constitution. Soon after its promulgation the country was overrun by its inveterate enemies; it was partitioned, and Poland's independence was no more. But the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 lived in the hearts of the Polish people, and today they celebrate the 172d anniversary of the Constitution's adoption and promulgation. I am indeed glad to join them in the anniversary of this truly epochmaking event.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for almost 200 years American and Polish patriots have experienced a common bond in their love of freedom.

The spirit of comradeship was first initiated through the contributions to American independence by the 18th cen-

tury Polish patriot, Count Casimir Pulaski. It was strengthened when, on May 3, 1791, Poland adopted its national Constitution only 2 years after the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. That the same spirit animates both of these great documents of liberty is evidenced by the following statement from the Polish Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

One hundred years ago, Mr. President, when our own Nation was engaged in a dreadful contest of survival for the Union, Polish patriots staged their greatest and bloodiest uprising against Russian tyranny. As in other uprisings against foreign domination—German or Russian—the gallant Polish struggle was finally overwhelmed by superior forces. But as in the other insurgent efforts also, the spirit of Polish liberty remained unquelled.

Therefore, my colleagues, this day of May 3 has significance not only for those of Polish origin, it is an anniversary which provides another monument for all men in their quest for freedom and liberty of the human spirit.

WILLIAM R. McANDREW WINS VFW AWARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, just a few weeks ago the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their annual dinner in Washington honoring Members of Congress who served in the Armed Forces. It was my privilege to serve in the Armed Forces in World War II and now to be an active member of the VFW. Like so many Members of the Congress, I was once again deeply impressed by the entire program. Certainly, it is a fact that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has become one of the most influential and important veterans organizations in our country, and for that reason, I was especially impressed by the award which the VFW presented to Mr. William R. McAndrew, executive vice president in charge of news for the National Broadcasting Co. At this time I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the introduction and citation of Mr. McAndrew by VFW Commander in Chief Byron B. Gentry, and Mr. McAndrew's acceptance remarks.

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

INTRODUCTION FOR WILLIAM R. McANDREW, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NBC NEWS

Many of you may remember that at this congressional dinner 1 year ago our organization paid tribute to Mr. Robert Kintner, president of the National Broadcasting Co. At that time Mr. Kintner informed us that his organization was working on a series of programs to be called "Profile of Communism." As in all organizations, the boss makes the announcements but it is left to others to carry out the assignments. Tonight we honor the man who carried out Mr. Kintner's assignment to produce an interdepartment study of communism. How well he performed his task can be attested to by the fact that after the second of the

"Profile of Communism" programs, the National Broadcasting Co. was asked to close its Moscow bureau and leave Russia. In other words, they hit the Russians where it hurts—with the truth. Our honored guest was also responsible for the remarkable program, "The Tunnel," which told with film the dramatic story of the people of East Berlin escaping to the West.

Mr. McAndrew has played a role at all levels of the continuing revolution in communications—as a Washington correspondent, as editor, bureau chief, and for the past 10 years as operating head of NBC News, which is widely regarded as the leading broadcast news operation.

Under Mr. McAndrew's guidance, NBC News has undergone a continuing expansion of staff and facilities that started 5 years ago. Its roster of correspondents and cameramen has grown from 400 to 700 and new foreign bureaus have been opened in Hong Kong, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Leopoldville and Ottawa.

During this same period, NBC News programming has been expanded until today it accounts for 25 percent of the entire NBC-TV network schedule and amounts to some 100 hours a month. In a single year, from 1960 to 1961, the number of hours of nighttime news programming increased by 22 percent.

In spite of a heavy administrative schedule, working on budgetary, personnel and programming matters, Mr. McAndrew keeps a close, hour-by-hour watch on news developments around the world. For major news events, such as a national convention, election or manned space launching, he frequently supervises the coverage from inside the control room itself.

As private citizens all of us should feel extremely grateful that we have a man such as William R. McAndrew heading up one of the world's largest news networks. The programming of the National Broadcasting Co. leave no doubt in the mind of anyone about which side of the fence they are standing on. These are people whom we are proud to call fellow Americans.

The citation reads as follows:

"In recognition of his outstanding accomplishments in the field of news and informational programs for the National Broadcasting Co. and as exemplified by such series as 'Profile of Communism' and the special program, 'The Tunnel.'"

ACCEPTANCE BY MR. McANDREW

Thank you for your warm and courteous welcome. It recalls a story that is told of the presidential campaign of 1928. Al Smith was making a paid political broadcast one night in Boston and was apparently all too conscious of the cost of the air time. As he began his remarks he held up a hand and told the studio audience:

"Save your applause until the end of the speech. It doesn't cost anything then."

In accepting this award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I want to express my personal appreciation and that of all of the NBC news staff, including those who spent several agonizing months under the wet earth of Berlin to film "The Tunnel," and those who also, in a sense, went underground to research the subterranean maneuvers recorded in the four programs of "Profile of Communism." You may recall some of the repercussions touched off by these programs: the protests from Berlin that preceded the showing of "The Tunnel" and the closing of our bureau in Moscow which followed the programs on Stalin and Khrushchev.

You may have noted some of our other overseas skirmishes during the past year or so—skirmishes, incidentally, which have prompted some at NBC News to consider founding our own "veterans of foreign news wars."

Its membership would include, of course, Piers Anderton and Gary Stindt, who headed

our coverage in the tunnel, as well as Russ Jones and Frank Bourgholtzer who were expelled from Moscow.

I would also propose the names of Grant Wolfkill, who was captured by the Communists in Laos and held prisoner for 15 months; James Robinson, who was refused renewal of credentials in Vietnam; John Rich, temporarily labeled "persona non grata" in France; Welles Hagen, threatened with expulsion from Pakistan, and Richard Valeriani, John Hlavacek, and Robert MacNeil, each of whom was imprisoned by Castro and finally expelled from Cuba.

These incidents have caused some of our people to suggest that we may be running out of friendly countries. What will happen, they ask, if our president, Bob Kintner, sets out on his annual tour of our foreign news bureaus and finds that he can cover them all in 3 days?

Others at NBC have expressed concern over David Brinkley's plans for a program to be titled "Our Man in Washington." Brinkley will cover, in his own special way, the political and social life of the Nation's Capital. However, I am not suggesting that in the wake of this program NBC News will be doing business from Silver Springs, Md.

My outlook is more optimistic. I suspect we will continue to have our problems with any who would manage the news, whether abroad or here at home. But I am convinced that it would take an extraordinary amount of attempted news managing to stop, or even slow down, the expanding coverage of broadcast news.

At NBC News, for example, we doubled our staff within a period of 5 years—from 400 full- and part-time news gatherers to a total of 800 in all parts of the world. In the same 5 years, we have nearly doubled the number of our permanently staffed foreign offices opening new bureaus at locations ranging from Ottawa to Buenos Aires to Leopoldville.

This expansion has permitted steady and substantial increase in our programing, an increase of more than 70 percent in 5 years. We now produce and broadcast more than one-fourth of all programs on the NBC television network. We recently discovered, with some surprise, that NBC news is now the largest supplier of network television programs, larger than any network program department, larger indeed than any of the great television production companies in Hollywood.

What brings us the greatest satisfaction, however, is the accumulating evidence that our news and informational programs are reaching more and more viewers. A recent study shows that each of 8 special nighttime programs presented by NBC news in the fourth quarter of last year attracted an audience averaging some 22 million viewers. "The Tunnel," which was 1 of these 8 programs, did even better than the average and drew an audience of more than 28 million.

One reason for these growing audiences, I believe, is the increasing skill of our writers, correspondents, producers, directors, and cameramen. They have learned, for example, that one way to look at medicine is through the eyes of an intern during a night's work in the Bellevue emergency ward, that one way to see Elizabethan England is to let the camera roam through the countryside as Shakespeare might have done, that a way to show the oppressiveness of communism is to follow a handful of students as they burrow their way into East Berlin in an attempt to save their friends and relatives.

We have learned not only to vary our techniques, but to vary our approach, our attitudes. It is interesting that two of our programs, almost diametrically opposed in their approach, recently won honors from the same group, the Thomas Alva Edison Awards. One was "David Brinkley's Journal," which is noted for casting a bright

light on America's flaws and imperfections. The other was "U.S. No. 1: American Profile," a poetic and admiring look at American history along Route 1 from Maine to Florida.

Finally, we have learned that news cannot be conveniently separated from history, or neatly compartmented into pigeonholes labeled "Politics," "Foreign Affairs," "Economics," "Science," and so on. We believe that past, present, and future are one continuous stream, that yesterday's politics in California can affect the economy of southern France tomorrow. We hold therefore that our province as newsmen embraces anything of significance that happens anywhere at any time.

Thus we are now working on special programs for next season on such diverse subjects as the French Army and its influence on French political life, the training of a professional football player, private art collections, the life and culture of modern India, the history of one of the world's great rivers, a train journey through the Iron Curtain, the way of life in modern Australia, and an examination of the progress being made toward the discovery of life in outer space.

We believe in sum that a society which is served by an instrument as powerful as television, one which reached tens of millions of people with a single program, and which looks with an unblinking gaze into the Kremlin, or under the Berlin wall or even into certain committee rooms of the Congress—that this society stands an excellent chance of remaining free.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier this year David E. Lilienthal, speaking at Princeton University in the Stafford Little Lecture series, delivered an address which merits high priority consideration as we study and develop a national fuels and energy policy and as we make allocation of our financial and technical resources in implementing such policy.

In his lecture entitled "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" Mr. Lilienthal traces the development of atomic energy policy from the early postwar period of optimism and illusion to the present period which has been tempered by reality. The burden of his theme is, in Mr. Lilienthal's words, to bring "the atom, both peaceful and military, back into perspective in the light of the facts not of 1945 or of 1950 or 1960, but of today."

There are, in my opinion, Mr. President, few persons in America today who speak with greater knowledge or a wider background in the entire spectrum of energy resources. As a former Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority from its beginning in 1933 to 1946, and as Chairman from 1941 to 1946, Mr. Lilienthal exercised high authority and assumed heavy responsibility for the development of both hydro- and coal-generated electrical power. Then, as first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1946 to 1950, David Lilienthal was one of the chief architects of our national policy in the field of atomic energy and the peaceful development of the atom. No one familiar with the background and philosophy of this statesman can question his competency in the energy field or his commitment to the peaceful utilization of the atom.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is of the utmost importance that the Congress and the executive branch give serious consideration to the appraisals of Mr. Lilienthal, as when he stated:

Today no one expects or even predicts that some magic of technology will be found whereby electricity from the atom can be produced so cheaply and abundantly as to cause profound changes in our way of life. Somewhere along the line the goal has shifted. Now the objective is a quite different one: To try to produce atomic electricity that is or will be just as good as electricity from coal, oil, or falling water; or to use more formal language, "competitive," meaning competitive in cost.

Mr. Lilienthal pointed out, however, that in view of the hazards of accident, human error or sabotage, and the "fiercely radioactive" character of waste materials from atomic powerplants, the label of "just as good" is a misleading one, even if and when atomic power can be generated at a cost competitive with that of coal generated electricity.

In measuring the present level of achievement against the early dreams of unlimited optimism, Mr. Lilienthal observes:

Everyone now knows there is no magic in uranium as a source of energy. The glamour, the excitement of the boundless possibilities of power from the peaceful atom is gone. The sooner we face up to this the better, for living in a world of unreality is as bad for technology and politics and to the peaceful atom as it is in the field of nuclear weapons.

But, as the former Chairman of the AEC comments:

In 1963 we still have an organization—the AEC—that in magnitude of expenditures and personnel is geared to the objective of 1946: A revolution to bring this magic into reality, bring on a new world.

Mr. Lilienthal then poses the question of what the action of Congress would have been in 1946, if we had known then what we now know. Accepting the valid and constructive, but not revolutionary, achievements of atomic research in medicine and chemistry, and acknowledging that the reality of atomic power development has fallen far short of the dream, would we now authorize such a radical departure as the Atomic Energy Commission and the outlay of some \$15 billion? That is, would we at that time have authorized such a massive outlay of financial and technical resources largely on the grounds of ultimately developing a fuel source competitive in cost with that of coal, oil, or falling water? Mr. Lilienthal doubts that Congress would have so acted, and he offers persuasive reasons in support of his opinion.

Mr. President, I do not presume to speak with any particular authority on matters regarding the development of the atom. There are other Members of this body, and particularly the distinguished senior Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the distinguished junior Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; they, as Senate members of

the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, speak with greater understanding and authority in this field than I. However, I can confirm, on my personal knowledge, the statement of Mr. Lilienthal that—

Improved technology and economics in the mining of coal and its transportation, greater efficiency in the transformation of coal's heat into electricity, and in long distance power transmission, have made coal in many parts of the country—including the Ohio Valley—by all odds the least costly source of energy except for some of the better water powersites. The U.S. supply of coal, with the new methods of mining and transportation of coal, and of electricity, seems at the moment to be more than adequate for decades at least—even in the face of the steeply mounting energy needs of this country.

In light of these facts regarding the adequacy and efficiency of coal as a major source of energy, Mr. Lilienthal then questioned whether the national interest justifies the current level of expenditure of funds for atomic power development.

In view of the extensive burden placed on our resources of both scientific manpower and money by space research, defense needs, and the development of the atom, I share in considerable degree Mr. Lilienthal's reservations about the wisdom of continuing to foster an atomic policy developed in the period from 1946 to 1950.

This certainly is not to say that our development of the atom has been a failure. On the contrary, as Mr. Lilienthal so properly stated:

Nothing has changed the majesty of the basic discovery or its theoretical potential. The trouble is, rather, with ourselves for allowing our determination that the atom should have a peaceful use as a source of energy to so grossly inflate our hopes. There are some who would say that what we need is a revised timetable of when these hopes may be realized. But in the meantime—and it may be many years—several other potential sources of energy and the improvement of existing sources may, as a consequence of the imperative of change, relegate atomic energy as a cost-competitive source of power to only specialized and limited applications.

Mr. President, in his Princeton University lecture, "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" Mr. Lilienthal has drawn from a deep reservoir of experience in the field of energy and power development. He has presented a closely reasoned argument in his eloquent appeal to American policymakers to cease thinking of the atom as opening the door to some magical transformation of our world, and to bring our atomic energy policy back into the mainstream of American scientific and technological development.

When the lecture—No. 3 in the Stafford Little Lecture series—was first brought to my attention, I addressed a communication to the President of Princeton University, requesting that the institution waive its copyrights to the extent of allowing the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the complete text of the Lilienthal lecture. I stated in that communication my belief that it would be in furtherance of the national interest to have this material before the

Congress as we study and debate our national fuels and energy requirements, and as we inquire into the possibilities of the development of a national fuels and energy policy. It is satisfying to report—and I am grateful for the opportunity to report—that Princeton University officials have been most cooperative in this matter and have authorized the publication of Mr. Lilienthal's text in the RECORD.

Shortly after this authorization message reached me, I received the following telegram from Mr. Lilienthal:

I am happy to note that the Princeton Press has notified you that my lecture on the peaceful atom is one that you may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was gratified to note that as a Senator you regard the subjects discussed by me in this lecture as ones that should be discussed in the national interest.

Respectfully,

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of Mr. Lilienthal's lecture on the subject "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" And, Mr. President, consistent with the authorization I received from the Princeton University Press, I request that the printed RECORD shall indicate that the text of this third of Mr. Lilienthal's lectures in the Stafford Little Lecture series is copyright 1963 by Princeton University Press.

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

[Copyright, Princeton University Press, 1963]

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

(Stafford Little Lectures 1963, No. III, Princeton University, by David E. Lilienthal)

In my opening discussion I said that the one great overriding imperative of mankind is change. I recalled from my own observation some of the specific ways in which, in the 20 years since the towering achievement of the first controlled release of the energy in the atom, the world of men and their ideas have undergone and continue to undergo swift and sweeping change.

The world of 1963, I said, is a world in motion, fluid, moving and responsive to the passions, needs, desires, evil and good, that lie in the heart of man. In contrast to this world of change, I asserted that our outlook and perspective on the atom had not changed in any substantial degree; that it was still dealt with as a thing apart from the whole fabric of human affairs. It is my theme in these lectures that such an outlook needs changing. I hope I can contribute to a new perspective in which the atom would be made an integral part of the mainstream of men's affairs.

Earlier I proposed that where the facts of the world of 1963 are in conflict with the way in which we think and deal with the atom, we should jettison and junk those outmoded ideas.

The burden of my theme then, is that we should begin the process of bringing the atom, both peaceful and military, back into perspective in the light of the facts not of 1945 or of 1950 or 1960, but of today. This theme applies with particular force to the peaceful atom, the subject of this third and concluding discussion.

A few days before Christmas of 1945 a young Senator from Connecticut, Brian McMahon, introduced a bill which some 8 months later was enacted into law and is known as the McMahon Act. The introduc-

tory words of this bill expressed a common conviction: that a revolutionary period based upon the peaceful use of atomic discoveries lay just ahead. I quote from the congressional declaration of policy of the McMahon Act:

"The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot now be determined. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life."

The declaration then concludes: "Accordingly it is hereby declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that the development and utilization of atomic energy shall be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition among private enterprises so far as is practicable, and cementing world peace."

A year later almost to the day, in the midafternoon of December 31, 1946, I was in President Truman's office in the White House with a group of my associates. I sat at the President's elbow as he signed a document that transferred from the Manhattan project, as it was called, the complex of wartime atomic energy facilities of factories, laboratories, and weapons to the five-man Atomic Energy Commission of civilians. At midnight on that same day, the forceful and dedicated Army officer, who had carried the responsibility for producing the first atomic bomb, issued a farewell message. This message included these words: "Five years ago the idea of atomic power was only a dream. You of the Army's Manhattan project have made that dream a reality." General Groves' statement then concluded: "With regard to peaceful applications, you have raised the curtain on vistas of a new world."

These declarations of the McMahon Act and of General Groves' farewell message reflected quite accurately the expectations widely held at the time they were made in 1945 and 1946. American domestic policy, and America's first efforts toward atomic disarmament, in which I participated, were erected on the foundation of just such expectations.

I fully shared these views, at that time, else I could not have with such conviction and intensity of effort joined in the work of trying to bring these expectations of a "new world" to reality, by the tapping of this new source of energy for civilian uses. More than once, as AEC chairman, in addressing an audience of fellow laymen, I began my remarks somewhat in this fashion: "This object that I hold in my hand," I used to say, holding up a short black cylinder, "is purified uranium metal. The energy in this handful of metal, when it has been converted through a controlled chain reaction in an atomic pile, is the equivalent," I used to say, "of umpteen train loads of coal." The actual number I forgot, and it isn't important. This was a way of trying to bring home to my fellow citizens the high stakes in finding scientific, technical, and economic means of realizing the great discoveries that had produced the atomic bomb. That was in the period of the late forties.

More than 15 years and hundreds of millions of dollars later, in 1963, what is the state of affairs?

Today no one expects or even predicts that some magic of technology will be found whereby electricity from the atom can be produced so cheaply and abundantly as to "cause profound changes in our present way of life." Somewhere along the line the goal has shifted. Now the objective is a quite different one: to try to produce atomic electricity that is or will be just as good as electricity from coal, oil, or falling water; or to use more formal language, "competitive," meaning competitive in cost.

I have used the phrase "just as good." But the potential hazards to life and health, of hundreds of thousands of people in densely populated areas adjacent to powerplants (such as that projected in the New York City's Borough of Queens) make it inaccurate to label atomic powerplants as "just as good" as conventional powerplants, even where the cost is virtually the same. In the event of accidents, human error, or sabotage, such atomic plants certainly present greater hazards than conventional powerplants.

The insurance industry of the United States refused to write insurance against so widespread a potential peril to human life and property damage that an atomic powerplant presents. So the Federal Government, by special statute, now underwrites this hazard. No such insurance problem exists as to nonatomic powerplants, of course.

Moreover, the waste materials from atomic powerplants—the atomic ashes, so to speak—are furiously radioactive. After all these years no entirely satisfactory technical way has been found to treat them so they will be safe, or even for their safe transportation from powerplants to underground storage. The underground storage of these deadly and massive wastes continue to constitute a potential source of danger to the population, and a source of considerable expense, as compared to the ashes of a conventional thermal electricity plant.

So "just as good" is far from the whole story. But except for these greater perils of radioactivity, hard to measure precisely, atomic electricity may well prove in time to be "competitive," or nearly so, as to cost, with energy from other sources.

The preamble to the McMahon Act explicitly set the expectations and premises of 1946: we were on the threshold of a new source of energy believed to be revolutionary in its profound consequences. It is interesting to recall that the Russians expressed much the same euphoric expectations about atomic energy at that time.

On this explicit premise radical and unprecedented measures were adopted by the Congress and the people. It was because of these expectations that for the first time in our history a new technical development became a monopoly of Government, its future entrusted not to normal competitive forces but to a single Government agency—the Atomic Energy Commission—armed with billions of dollars and the broadest of powers. This was for America a radical step, and was recognized as such. Nothing of this nature had ever been resorted to in order to further other technical discoveries, discoveries or inventions that did in fact revolutionize our way of life: the dynamo, the electric light, the automotive engine, the aeroplane, the radio tube.

Why did we make this radical departure from our time-tested method of developing a new technology? Certainly not just to produce something just as good as we had before. No, it was because of a conviction that there was an overriding national interest in development of a new source of energy expected to have a profound effect on our way of life. This was the national interest that was thought to be at stake, that justified these extraordinary measures. It was this national interest that justified a prodigious scale of effort, unheard of expenditures of public money, fantastic absorption of a large portion of the scientific, and technical and industrial resources of the Nation.

The scale of effort today, in 1963, continues unabated. The AEC is actually pressing for a new program, to cost \$2 billion over a decade. Not just improvements in existing reactors, but a whole new line of technology, the so-called breeder reactor, is now being boomed, with predictions ranging from nebulous to conservative. But the goal, the expectations that justified the earlier scale of effort, and our departure from our tradi-

tional ways of furthering technology has proved long since unattainable.

Does what made sense in 1946 still make sense in 1963? This is what I ask that we consider.

Suppose in 1946, when the McMahon Act was passed, Congress had been told what we now know but did not know then: that if you will vest great powers in a special and unique Government agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, if you build great research and development laboratories all over the country, explore for, find and buy uranium here and abroad, subsidize the costs of uranium fuel, bear large development costs and part of capital costs for manufacturers of electric equipment and utilities—if you do these things at the cost of billions of dollars for 20 or 30 years the country will have a new source of civilian electricity that is just as good and costs no more than what would be produced without the AEC, without these facilities and expenditures? What would Congress have said? My guess is that the Congress and the people would have gone any lengths for military objectives of the atom, such as weapons and the submarine, but would have said "nothing doing" on such a prospectus for peaceful civilian electricity. Of course, no one could confidently predict in 1946 that the revolutionary expectations would turn out not to be realizable. The effort was certainly one that well deserved a hard try. The quality of men and work has been superb. But it is relevant to ask how much longer is the Government justified in pursuing this will-o'-the-wisp of power so cheap that it will profoundly change our way of life?

There was and is a great national interest in a new source of energy that would be revolutionary. There is no such overriding national interest in the same kind of electricity even at the same cost, though with far greater risk to the population, since private and public power utilities, manufacturers and fuel producers are perfectly capable of meeting that need in the foreseeable future whether by conventional or atomic plants.

Everyone now knows there is no magic in uranium as a source of energy. The glamour, the excitement of the boundless possibilities of power from the peaceful atom is gone. The sooner we face up to this the better, for living in a world of unreality is as bad for technology and politics as to the peaceful atom as it is in the field of nuclear weapons, a subject discussed earlier in these lectures.

But we have failed as a nation to recognize and give effect to this realization that the profound changes, arising out of a revolution in atomic energy supply, just aren't in the cards. And yet in 1963 we still have an organization—the AEC—that in magnitude of expenditures and personnel is geared to the objective of 1946: a revolution to bring this magic into reality, to bring on a new world.

The facts of 1963, in my opinion, show that the time has come for drastic and perhaps painful reevaluation of the peaceful atom in two respects:

First, the concept of what the peaceful atom means to us today, and the realistic prospects in the immediate future.

Second, a reevaluation of the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission itself, the establishment we have built up to bring to reality the hopes and expectations we had a right to hold 15 years ago.

Where do we stand today?

Immediately President Truman had signed the Executive order transferring the wartime properties of the Manhattan District to the civilian Atomic Energy Commission, we proceeded to fortify and expand an already extensive atomic establishment. A good deal of this expansion and additional investment, indeed most of it, was attributable to research and production plants in order that

atomic bombs could be improved in design and their production speeded up.

But the nonmilitary Atomic Energy Commission program claimed a very great deal of attention and investment of many facilities and of human talents. The universities of the southeast were brought together in a great expansion of the Oak Ridge Institute, and of the nonmilitary facilities at Oak Ridge. A similar program bringing in universities but emphasizing national laboratories has been carried out at the Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island, the laboratory at the University of Iowa at Ames, the scientific complex in New Mexico, the laboratory and facilities at Berkeley. One could continue this tabulation even further.

Never has there been, anywhere in the world, so broad and generously financed an attack on the technical and economic problems of bringing a new scientific discovery into the realm of reality and of widespread use. This prodigious effort was predicated on the belief and hope that this great new source of energy for mankind could produce results as dramatically and decisively beneficial to man as the bomb was dramatically destructive.

This vast establishment of laboratories and institutes, of scholarships, or huge atom-smashers—accelerators—and of nuclear power reactors—all these today we have. This program continues and, expands, the total sums spent being very great.

But there are differences. The difference is in goals and objectives I have mentioned. But there is also, significantly, a difference in mood. The enthusiasm, the sense of being in an heroic period, the sense of dealing with a benign force of revolutionary consequence, much of this has eroded. In contrast now we are told of possible savings of a mill or two a kilowatt-hour, in another 5 or 10 years, or of conserving our fuel resources in another fifty or a hundred years. Even those who laid their technical reputations on the line, and who made enthusiastic predictions of a few years ago are becoming disenchanted.

A newspaper story of May 18, 1962, sums up, in lay terms, the spirit of today. A great naval officer, noted for his achievements and self-confidence, was a witness before a congressional committee. Admiral Rickover "advised Congress to make an initial investment in a big 500,000 kilowatt nuclear powerplant—but not with the idea that it would produce economically competitive power." The witness' statement on the proposed plant's capability, the story commented, "was in contrast to glowing predictions given to the committee in the past about proposed powerplants."

In the 1940's it was reasonable to join in General Groves' and Senator McMahon's view of the possibility of a "new world" that peaceful applications of atomic energy might bring. Responsible men spoke of atomic power so cheap it wouldn't pay to meter it. Most of us were less exuberant by far. Yet even those with a less euphoric outlook had ample grounds to believe that the expectations of the 1940's and the early 1950's should be given a hard try, and that such an effort had a good chance of paying.

Even in those early days the AEC's general advisory committee, for example—a group of giants—uttered words of caution about this new world. Others, such as Philip Sporn, reminded the country and the scientific community that power from the atom is like any other power: that the atom is just another kind of fuel, not a magic short-cut to almost costless electricity. But for the most part these voices were not heeded.

A great satirist, Frank Sullivan, had himself a very good time kidding the cliches of exuberance of those days. Some of you

will remember the testimony, in question and answer form, of Frank Sullivan's creation, the cliché expert, Mr. Arbuthnot. Here are a few excerpts from Mr. Sullivan's piece entitled "The Cliche Expert Testifies on the Atom," written in 1948.

From the witness stand Mr. Arbuthnot, the cliché expert, told his examiner that he'd better learn to use the words "harness" and "unleash" if he expected to talk about the atom. "They are two words frequently used. With pea, of course."

Question: "Why pea?"

Answer: "Our everything is in terms of the pea. You know how much U^{235} it would take to drive a car to the moon and back?"

Question: "No, sir. How much?"

Answer: "A lump the size of a pea."

Question: "You wouldn't settle for a lump the size of a radish or a bean?"

Answer: "Sorry. The pea is the accepted vegetable in these explanations."

Reading some current atomic power predictions, the colloquy with the cliché expert—if Mr. Sullivan will look the other way—might continue in this way:

Question: "After 17 years, where are we in 1963, Mr. Arbuthnot?"

Answer: "Threshold. That is the correct cliché today. We are on the threshold of cheap atomic power. You'll have to learn that word if you expect to be an atomic expert, my friend."

Question: "But didn't you, in 1954, testify that we were then on the 'threshold'. And then again in 1960, didn't you say the same thing?"

Answer: "Yes, of course I did. Threshold it was and threshold is still the correct cliché."

Question: "And how high is that threshold in 1963?"

Answer: "High? Oh, the same height as in 1954. Hundreds of millions of dollars a year high. Breeder."

Question: "Breeder, Mr. Arbuthnot? This is a mixed audience and I'll ask you to watch your language."

Answer: "Take it easy. Breeder, that's the newest atomic cliché. When you get asked hard questions about the old-fashioned atomic powerplant, just say 'breeder' and you're off the hook, because a breeder atomic plant has never yet been built so who can dispute the lovely forecasts? You'll learn this atomic cliché thing yet, my friend."

The ease with which Mr. Sullivan made fun of the clichés of 1948 may have indicated that perhaps there was more than a little puffing in the buildup of atomic energy. Or perhaps it simply shows that even as to great scientific discoveries a little kidding now and then is healthy. It might be useful—and fun—if Mr. Sullivan turned his considerable talents for satire loose on some of the purple clichés about the space age, current successor to the atomic new world.

To recapitulate: what then is the record? In the effort to produce economic atomic power the U.S. Government in the past 20 years has invested great sums in plants, laboratories, reactors and in incentives. Note that incentives cost as much as subsidies but avoids that naughty word.

For the country as a whole, except where the costs of producing electricity from other sources of heat are high, atomic power is not cheaper but costlier than conventional power.

The main reasons for this, to oversimplify, appear to be three. First, the amount of investment in plant to produce atomic power turned out to be far greater than could have been anticipated. Second, problems of safety to the population are by no means solved, and require expense of considerable magnitude. But the third reason is probably as important as these two. To most everyone's surprise the cost of elec-

tricity from coal has been drastically reduced in recent years, and is continuing to be further reduced as the reserves of coal in locations that new technology makes economic, are ample for a considerable period.

The story of the second coming of coal as a source of energy in the past 10 years is a good illustration of how difficult it is to predict a specific change on a long-range basis.

The most recent report of the AEC on atomic power predicts the state of our coal and oil reserves in a century or less and also predicts the state of affairs two centuries hence. This is worth no more, I fear, than a prediction made in 1763 before the automobile, about what the highway system of America would be like in 1863 and 1963.

Coal is not glamorous, like the atom or waterpower. It is a very humble source of electricity. The coal industry for two generations was called a sick industry. For a long time technical advances in mining and transporting coal at lower cost and of producing electricity from the heat of burning coal advanced hardly at all in an economic sense. In the mysterious way by which changes take place at the most unexpected places, suddenly coal in the last decade has made enormous strides.

I recall the judgment on an atomic energy international ownership proposal, of the distinguished British physicist, Dr. P. M. S. Blackett. Writing in 1948 he said, "America's fuel reserves are only likely to be adequate in the future at steeply rising costs." This proved to be off the beam by 180 degrees. Actually the proven reserves have increased and electric generating costs have declined "steeply."

This is not the place to describe that progress toward lower and lower costs of coal-generated electricity. It is enough to say that improved technology and economics in the mining of coal and its transportation, greater efficiency in the transformation of coal's heat into electricity, and in long-distance power transmission have made coal in many parts of the country—including the Ohio Valley—by all odds the least costly source of energy except for some of the better waterpower sites. The U.S. supply of coal, with the new methods of mining and transportation of coal and of electricity seems at the moment to be more than adequate for decades at least, even in the face of the steeply mounting energy needs of this country.

But is the issue of 1963 whether uranium as a fuel is, or will be, less or more costly than coal by a mill or two per unit of electricity? This appears to be the current justification for expenditure of Government funds for atomic development. But if that is all that is presently at stake, I doubt whether the national interest justifies these expenditures. Certainly, the justification is a far cry from the initial prospectus for this extensive program.

A word about other fuels: gas and oil.

Natural gas prices have been rising, and its future as a boiler fuel is limited because of its higher value for other uses. Fuel oil is a byproduct of the oil industry's production of higher value products and, therefore, offers only limited competition to coal as a fuel for the rapidly expanding production of electric power, except in especially favorable locations.

But it was not only a major economic source of heat and power that those vast expenditures were intended to secure. It was believed that atomic discoveries would produce revolutionary advances not only in basic science but in their application in medicine and in the growing of food and fiber, a revolutionary contribution to the conquest of poverty and disease on a worldwide scale.

Turning now briefly to these other areas of the peaceful atom. The radioactive isotope has indeed been a great boon as a tool of science. Those who in the forties sensed that this might well be the greatest benign use of atomic energy have thus far been proven right. The radioactive isotope has had important, though still limited, applications, in medicine and in a few other areas, such as in chemical engineering. As to industrial applications though a new and realistic note of prudence is emerging. Dow Chemical Co., for example, recently announced its success in using a radioactive substance, cobalt 60, as a catalyst to produce small quantities of the organic compound, ethyl bromide. The headline was of the style of the old exuberant era: "The atom runs a chemical plant." But in the fine print, the company's chemist said, "It's just another type of catalyst, another tool to consider. Ultraviolet light and chemical agents may still be the best, most economical way to produce many chemicals." The atom in chemistry is now seen to be a part of the mainstream of chemistry, not a kind of magic.

There continues to be a very high level of intellectual excitement and progress in physics, following the path cut a generation ago by such giants as the late Niels Bohr and his younger creative counterparts, some of them in the very community where I am speaking to you tonight. The money and brains devoted to nuclear science apart from research and development for atomic power, have, I think, been well spent. I am, however, not the only one by any means who questions whether as large a part of our total resources of brains and money as is devoted to this area of science—the millions on accelerators for example—is justified compared with the opportunities in other fields such as biochemistry.

The problems of securing safe and competitively economic power from the atom have proved to be very considerable. Other sources of power are ample and are diminishing in cost.

If we accept these propositions, we will have a new perspective that can save vast sums of Government funds; a great deal of scientific and technical talent could be more beneficially used in other areas. For this I believe we can be sure: at the time and place the economics of power show need for atomic energy when compared with the costs and safety of power from other sources of energy the manufacturers of equipment and the utility industry, private and public, will supply that need without Government prodding.

Where there is no present or prospective economic need for a product or service, does it make sense for the Government of the United States to continue to spend as much as it does on civilian atomic energy? I strongly doubt this. Military applications, including the nuclear submarine powerplant, stand in a different category, of course.

Does it make sense for some of America's ablest technical men in the AEC, its contractors, and in industry to confront frustration after frustration for no presently foreseeable overriding public purpose, as things now stand? The question deserves an objective analysis, not served by another round of long-range predictions of what we shall need in 2063.

We can well be proud—I certainly am—of our great atomic laboratories in the establishment of several of which I had some direct responsibility. But should we assume they always expand, that they will never be cut back in favor of other kinds of research? A kind of Parkinson's law of research has developed: that research expands as fast as money for that work is made available. Fifteen billions of dollars of Federal funds for research could become 30 billions if we

don't take a hard look at Parkinson's law of research soon.

In our constantly expanding research and development efforts should we not stop to question the effect on the scale of those efforts of the rise of new scientific areas of at least equal, perhaps greater, promise than that of the peaceful atom?

Another question: the Atomic Energy Commission continues to stockpile uranium. By 1966, we are told, there will be a surplus of uranium over needs for weapons and reactors of a value of a billion dollars. Do the prospects for atomic reactors in the coming decade justify such a surplus reserve? If not, can we afford to build a kind of atomic political pork barrel, or a uranium congressional bloc like the silver bloc?

The reasons we continue to do these things in the face of the changed prospects that atomic power will have a profound effect on American life are various.

Some are straight political ones. Some are the natural and justifiable pride of men whose technical careers have been given over to this goal and who have understandable difficulty being wholly objective about the results.

But deeper still, I think, are the remnants of a noble resolve that we must prove that the atom has a present peaceful non-weapons use of very great importance.

As first chairman of AEC and before that as one of those who helped draft a State Department proposal for international control of the atom I had a share in formulating and popularizing that hope of unlimited peaceful potentials. But in the intervening 17 years the hopes are considerably dimmed. The rhetoric and the emotion, however, linger on; the facts should be faced, for they will prevail.

Is the peaceful atom then a goldbrick, a fiasco, a flop? Not at all. Nothing has changed the majesty of the basic discovery of its theoretical potential. The trouble is rather with ourselves for allowing our determination that the atom should have a peaceful use as a source of energy to so grossly inflate our hopes. There are some who would say that what we need is a revised timetable of when these hopes may be realized. But in the meantime—and it may be many years—several other potential sources of energy and the improvement of existing sources may, as a consequence of the imperative of change, relegate atomic energy as a cost-competitive source of power to only specialized and limited applications.

Why were our hopes inflated?

The basic cause, I think, was a conviction, and one that I shared fully, and tried to inculcate in others, that somehow or other the discovery that had produced so terrible a weapon simply had to have an important peaceful use. Such a sentiment is far from ignoble. We are a peace-loving people. Everyone, our leaders and laymen and scientists and military men, wanted to establish that there is a beneficial use of this great discovery. We were grimly determined to prove that this discovery was not just a weapon. This led perhaps to wishful thinking, a wishful elevation of the "sunny side" of the atom. So we did not see atomic energy as just another form of heat, another fuel. We gave it a unique status. We took it out of the stream of life, made for it a place apart.

Now our emotional attitude has swung to the other extreme. We are disenchanted with the peaceful atom as if it were somehow human and had deliberately failed us.

The strong attraction of the peaceful atom as an offset to the terrors of the atom's destructiveness as a weapon have led to some strange results. A few words about them may illuminate the problem we face in getting the peaceful atom into perspective, of returning it to its place as one part of our scientific and technical development.

And it is to seek a new perspective that is the theme of these discussions.

One or two illustrations will do for our purpose. Years ago the Russians announced that, unlike the bloodthirsty Americans who only thought of the atom in terms of destruction, they, the Russians, were developing this explosive for peaceful purposes, such as great excavation for ports and the like. Most knowledgeable people at that time thought this was a characteristic piece of Soviet cold war propaganda, and obvious nonsense. Yet the pressure on us to prove that atomic weapons were not the only product of these great scientific efforts was such that our own atomic energy program has gone in for this kind of thing: projects for blowing out harbors, making explosions underground to produce steam and so on. Without judging the details of these undertakings, the important thing is that it shows how far the desire of scientists and administrators will carry them when we try to establish a nonmilitary use when no substantial one of current importance has been proven.

For example, dramatic pictures of a great hole blasted out in the desert by a peaceful atomic explosion, in July 1962, were released to the press by AEC, for the first time, in November. The release was at a time when the AEC's budget for this kind of spectacular was before the Budget Bureau. Or to take another example: as a buildup for this peaceful use of the atom the amount of earth moved by this explosion in the desert was compared with the earth moved in digging a tunnel under New York's East River, where an atomic explosion would hardly be welcomed. This is just another of the many instances of the way in which public relations techniques—the not-so-hidden persuader—have been used to promote the appropriation of funds for the atom.

Another consequence of this same kind of effort to glamorize the atom is a foreign aid program within the Atomic Energy Commission, part of President Eisenhower's program in 1954 called atoms for peace. An elaborate ritual for providing atomic research and reactor equipment and technology to such countries as Thailand and Guatemala and other similar underdeveloped countries became an expensive showpiece of the AEC program. Much of this was as meaningless and wasteful an operation as could be imagined; for most of these countries had hardly a cadre of scientists, or the necessary facilities to put this exchange of atomic knowledge to any significant use. Even as a propaganda move it was self-defeating and naive. A great many of these countries need and could use doctors and medicine, storage batteries, plows and fertilizers and seed—and good elementary scientific instruction. Only the desire to prove somehow that atoms were for peace could justify the absurdity of a separate program, not in the foreign aid part of the State Department, but in the AEC.

Let me cite another consequence of the "come hither" of the peaceful atom, so that it overshadows other equally promising areas of science. From the very beginning of the AEC, it has always been easier to get Congress to appropriate funds for science and research if somehow the atom can be tacked on to the request. This is not to deprecate the importance of the huge accelerators running into the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been provided for, or the elaborate and even luxurious laboratories that have grown up at Oak Ridge, the Argonne, Brookhaven, and Berkeley. These vast and extensive scientific establishments at public expense are amply justified, even though the results for science would seem rather disappointing when compared with the possibilities and needs of alternative ways of furthering basic science. But there are other

claimants for research funds, such as in medical research, particularly in the field of biology.

I submit that it will not be possible for Congress to allocate appropriately the total resources of the country to be expended on scientific research and development so long as the atom is thought of and dealt with not as one segment of scientific effort to be balanced against other segments, but as a thing apart. Until the atom is brought back fully into the mainstream of the scientific effort of the country, as an element of that mainstream, Congress will continue to be vulnerable to special pleading for funds for atomic research with little opportunity realistically to weigh that field against the needs and opportunities of other parts of science. Science is a single fabric. To separate out the atom may have seemed justified in 1946 or even 1956. One must seriously question whether this is any longer justified in the light of 1963.

Of all our national resources, minds are the most important. Two-thirds of the trained minds available for exploring our scientific and technical frontiers are absorbed by the atomic energy, space and defense activities of our country. Let me underline that: two-thirds.

As a consequence all the rest of America's needs are, relatively, impoverished, neglected and starved.

For the first time the country is beginning to realize that you cannot have a satisfactory economic growth rate we hear so much about but of which we see little, if this two-thirds allocation of our trained brains goes on much longer. President Kennedy's Economic Report to Congress of December 21, 1962, has this comment to make: "We have," he said of this two-thirds absorption of trained minds, "paid a price by sharply limiting the scarce scientific and engineering resources available to the civilian sectors of the American economy."

The civilian sectors is a colorless economist's term for what it is that keeps America going. Cut off the research and technical blood supply to the civilian sectors and the space, defense, and atomic energy programs will have no one left to pay their bills. Cutting back on this drain on scarce brains isn't proposed in the President's economic report. I suggest Congress consider the atomic energy program as one good place to begin to cut back sharply, to make more brains available to some of the presently starved civilian areas of science and technology.

Three propositions then need to be weighed, debated, and conclusions reached if we are to bring up to date our basic premise about the peaceful atom, vintage 1963.

I suggest the 1963 premises should be these:

1. Energy from the atom is not now needed for civilian purposes.

2. At the time and place where it is needed it will be forthcoming without governmental prodding. If there is a real need, it will be met by the utility and manufacturing industries, as it has been with the automobile, the diesel engine, the telephone, and so on, in response to proved economic need.

3. There is now no urgent fuels or power crisis and no prospect of one in the foreseeable future; when such a shortage looms, it will be taken care of by the atom if that is then the best alternative.

In short, then, we should stop trying to force feed atomic energy. Throw away the present discredited timetable. Don't abandon the hope, of course, but deal with it realistically.

The same approach should apply to the atom in basic science, in medicine, and agriculture, and industry; weigh these claims for funds for research and development efforts along with others, not give the atom a place apart.

If we are going to readjust our ideas about the emphasis we ought to place on the peaceful atom then perhaps some revision is in order as to the agency that has responsibility for it. This is said not because the AEC has not done a good job, but the contours of its job should conform to our 1963 picture of the atom, not that of 1946 when it was established.

Why did Congress, in 1946, with the country's general approval set up a wholly separate agency for the atom? This made good sense in 1946 for three chief reasons:

1. At that time, we alone had the bomb. We had committed ourselves to international control. We were sincerely attempting to prove to the world that our intentions were peaceful. Therefore, custody and control and development of this terrible new force were properly placed in the hands of a civilian agency—not the military.

2. Secrecy. Collecting all of the functions relating to the atom in a single huge agency seemed to be the best safeguard possible against the loss of the scientific and technical secrets we and the British together had in our possession.

3. Third, atomic energy was generally expected to transform the face of industrial society within a short space of time, and therefore a special new agency was clearly needed to prepare and plan for such a dynamic change.

These reasons were certainly valid in 1946 and 1947. But what about today? Let's look at them in the light of the facts of 1963.

1. First, the emphasis on a civilian agency. The world is now and has been for some years in an atomic arms race. The hope of international control is dim. Not only does Russia have the bomb, but France will soon, and other nations as well in due course. The military facts of 1963 now have forced us to place large quantities of nuclear arms directly in the hands of our military—in the skies, in missiles, beneath the earth's surface, under the seas.

We still have civilian control in the sense that the President, as always, is responsible, but the role of the AEC as a special civilian custodian and watchdog is, of necessity, a fiction.

The AEC functions chiefly as a designer, developer, maker and tester of atomic weaponry. These are grave technical responsibilities, and have been carried with distinction by able men. But as the reason for a sharp separation between civilian and military roles has faded, so the distinctive role of the AEC has changed. The AEC as weaponizer has in fact become perhaps very much a part of the Military Establishment of the Nation, serving the needs and goals of that Military Establishment as defined by the military. The spectrum of weapons and the range of war plans is now very broad indeed, from intercontinental missiles to conventional tools of the infantry or of guerrilla warfare. With so broad a context the AEC, expert in nuclear weaponry alone, can hardly provide an indispensable independent civilian judgment to the Chiefs of Staff. Realistically, isn't the AEC essentially not too different from any major technical contractor to the Defense Department in the area of missiles, say, or other new weapons?

2. As for the second reason, secrecy, the reasons for secrecy diminished in 1949, when Russia tested its first bomb. Atomic secrecy still has some value to us, but since 1949 it has become progressively less crucial. First, because we realized gradually that secrecy in basic science is a myth. Second, because the variety of secrets (that is, of temporary technological advantages) has multiplied—in rocketry, in submarines, etc.—and is very far from being preponderant in the atomic field, as once had been the case. The function of the AEC as a gigantic strongbox for all the major U.S. weapon se-

crets—the picture in 1946—just does not jibe with the facts of 1963.

3. The new world of atomic plenty, as reviewed earlier does not exist. Certainly the peaceful atom occupies a subordinate role in the development of the United States today and will continue thus for years to come.

In sum, the three chief reasons for the establishment of the AEC in 1946 are no longer wholly valid in the world of 1963. This is not to say that the AEC has failed. It certainly has not. But we ought to take a fresh look at the AEC and be sure that it is geared to the realities of today, and not to the exploded premises of 1946.

The reality is that the atom has not justified the separate and unique status which Congress understandably assigned it in 1946. It has not been the ultimate weapon as once was said, not the single necessary weapon. It has not revolutionized industrial society. It has achieved good, heartwarming results, but no revolutionary advance in medicine. The peaceful atom has not ushered in a new world but has rather become a part, a minor part, of the old one. And yet the official sponsor and trustee of the atom in this country, the Atomic Energy Commission, has hardly changed at all.

A revision of the AEC so that its functions conform to the facts of 1963 would seem to be in order. To recommend the details of how such a reemphasis ought to be worked out in terms of transfer of functions and even loppings-off are not a responsibility of mine or any other private citizen. Whether the AEC has one administrator or its present five commissioners, or whether such-and-such a division ought to be reduced from 50 desks to 1 or 2 *** these matters are of interest to me chiefly as a taxpayer.

What does concern me is that steps are taken to get the atom fully back into the stream of American life, and in a role of proper proportions. I want my government to continue to encourage, through every means, the broad growth of scientific research and development—and that means all of science not as in the past singling out the atom for preferential treatment. I do not want atomic science, because of the euphoria of the past, or present-day lobbying power, to secure more than its justifiable share of our research resources of money and brains. If the most efficient way of insuring a balanced scientific development means transferring from the AEC all of its grants or scholarships, and turning these over, say, to the National Science Foundation, then I would be heartily in favor of such a move. Similarly, I favor continuing technical and financial aid to underdeveloped countries and if in certain instances such aid would be wisely supplemented by an atomic power installation, well and good. But the idea of a separate atomic point 4 program, carried on almost as if the larger and more comprehensive scheme of foreign aid did not exist, makes no sense to me whatsoever.

This artificial apartness of the atom in areas where this is not justified has been and is not only wasteful but harmful. Let me cite but one example of many.

A few years ago almost by accident the public discovered that containers of low-level radioactive waste products were being dumped into the coastal waters of Massachusetts. In that area fishing is an important industry and a source of food for the whole Northeast. In the summer the beaches are used by millions of people for recreation. This dumping was done with the permission of the AEC, but apparently the marine biologists and the State and Federal agencies with responsibility for health did not supervise the dumping. The AEC suffered in prestige by this unfortunate assumption that because radiation was its field, they were also experts on public health. A more serious consequence: by this sense of atomic apartness the State and Federal public

health services were deprived of the opportunity to become fully knowledgeable of the radiation hazards—or absence of hazards—in such wastes and how to protect against them. Today more and more the functions of AEC that involve existing technical agencies are being slowly transferred to those agencies. This is a move in the direction I urge: putting the atom into the mainstream of men's affairs, not artificially keeping it separate and apart.

What I have been trying to do in this discussion is:

To take a look at the peaceful atom and also at the executive establishment concerned with the atom, in the light of the facts of 1963. This has been an effort to see the peaceful atom not as it once was viewed, but as it really is today. On the basis of that examination I have suggested some changes are due, perhaps overdue. What I have said of the peaceful atom is based on the theme of these lectures; namely, that the atom is not something magic and separate and apart, but is an integral part of the whole fabric of life of which change is the basic imperative.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable Howell Appling, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Oregon, has called to the attention of my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, and myself the enrolled senate joint memorial 4 which was adopted recently by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague and myself, that this memorial, dealing with the importance of obtaining adequate funds for the water pollution control program at Oregon State University, be set forth at this point in my remarks.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

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

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, is legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas under the 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Oregon State University at Corvallis has been selected as the site for the Pacific Northwest regional laboratory for the conduct of research, investigation, experiments, field demonstrations, and studies and training relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and

Whereas the site has been established on the campus and funds have been appropriated for the construction of this facility; and

Whereas there is need for programming and establishing research at an early date prior to the completion of the actual laboratory building scheduled for early 1965, staff must be recruited and research in its initial phases must be undertaken in order that the laboratory can be used to its utmost effectiveness as soon as it is available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to provide support for initiating and carrying out research relating to water pollution problems by introducing in

the fiscal year 1964 budget necessary funds for hiring staff and initiating research for the water pollution control program at Oregon State University.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to each Member of the Washington, Idaho, and Montana delegations.

Adopted by senate March 5, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house April 20, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, the Nation and the world have been witness in recent days to a spectacle of racial bigotry in the United States that would disgrace a Union of South Africa or a Portuguese Angola.

It is no longer possible for decent citizens to sit in silence, whether they are public officials or not, and tolerate by that silence the massive and oppressive denial of constitutional rights that is occurring in several areas of the United States.

The conflict between peaceful Negro demonstrators and police in the cities of America brings to mind nothing so much as the assaults of the Nazi Party storm troopers against the Jews, and the unleashing of Communist soldiers against peaceful demonstrators in Eastern Europe.

Unless American citizens are willing to stand up and demand an end to these scenes of police brutality and disregard for civil rights, our constitutional guarantees will be no better than those of Hitler's Germany or Communist Russia.

Aside from the merely moral indecency of what has been transpiring, police authorities in certain southern communities are crushing the exercise of rights supposedly guaranteed to every American by nothing less basic than the Constitution.

The heroic Americans who are completing the march for equality begun by William Moore are doing no more than exercising their right to freedom of speech, and their right to petition their government for a redress of grievances. Under the Federal Constitution, they are guaranteed that right by the first article of the Bill of Rights. I would be surprised if they are not also supposed to be guaranteed that right by the constitution of the State which took it from them.

Moreover, they are exercising the right of all Americans to move freely from one State to another, a right recognized by the Supreme Court, and a right that was denied them when they were arrested not upon violation of law but merely upon their entry into one of our States. In my opinion, the local authorities responsible for the travesty should be prosecuted on both grounds.

Let us remember that we are long past the day when citizens were secure in their constitutional right only against the officers and action of the Federal Government. The executive officers of

the Federal Government have the duty to protect Americans in the exercise of their constitutional rights against their infringement by State authority, as well.

I know it is said that the civil rights statutes are relatively weak. But some do exist. I know it is said that in the past the courts have limited their application. But even within those limitations, there is room for the Justice Department to make clear that the Federal Government is not entirely powerless to intervene.

Section 242 of title 18 of the United States Code makes it a punishable offense for anyone "under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, (to) willfully subject any inhabitant of any State, territory, or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

I can think of the Bill of Rights, with its supposed guarantee of free speech, petition, and peaceful assembly; I can think of the 14th amendment, with its supposed guarantee that no State shall make or enforce any law which abridges the privileges or immunities of American citizens and which also forbids a State to deny any person life, liberty, or equal protection of its laws.

The Supreme Court has indicated that for any local official to be brought to account under this section there must be shown an intent upon his part to deny a Federal right. Surely there is evidence that there was such intent in the case of the memorial marchers.

There is also evidence that there is an intent to deny the right of peaceful assembly and freedom of speech to the demonstrators in Birmingham, Ala. The use of hoses and dogs upon peaceful demonstrators is such evidence, in my opinion.

I hope the Department of Justice will reexamine its legal weapons in these cases. I hope it will recognize that the courts will never tell it when to move in to protect American rights; it is up to the Justice Department to act within the rules already laid down by the courts and proceed to test by action whether or not the courts agree with its interpretation of its powers.

For this enforcement arm of the National Government to do nothing, except to send mediators and await reports from the combat zone, is a shameful commentary on American democracy. If indeed, the Justice Department does act in defense of American rights and is not upheld by the Federal courts, than it should seek whatever new legislation is necessary to empower it to act.

It will never be good enough for this, or any administration of the Federal Government, to wring its hands over the inadequacy of legislation in this field. The test of this administration is whether it is willing to exercise its existing authority to the full, and then seek from Congress whatever additional authority is needed to put an end to the police atrocities which have been occurring.

To the extent that these demonstrations are against segregation of public facilities in Alabama, and the denial of the right to vote in Mississippi, they are

against something already known to be illegal. The demonstrators are asking that the law simply be upheld, but they are not even being accorded that right by the legal authorities of those States.

Aside from the legal side of this issue, there is the even more urgent moral side of it. I can think of no action anywhere in these United States that is a more completely un-American activity than that of the Alabama police in arresting the Moore marchers and in attacking the Birmingham demonstrators. Such spectacles must bring great joy to the hearts of Communists everywhere, as they see American law officers putting down peaceful demonstrations in the same fashion as the Communist police put them down. Arrests, imprisonment, and brutality are the methods of totalitarianism everywhere, in Cuba, East Germany, in Red China, and apparently, in certain parts of the American South.

No conscientious American can continue to remain silent. This is not a matter that can be met with passivity on the part of the majority, and left to the Negroes and whites of the South to fight it out among themselves. What is going on down there today is an infinitely greater threat to American freedom than Cuba, for indeed, if we cannot and do not protect America freedom in southern America, then where can we and where will we protect it?

I made the foregoing remarks because I think they are a deserving and fitting tribute to a magnificent article written by Joel J. Sprayregen, general counsel, Illinois division, American Civil Liberties Union, entitled, "Of Dogs and Freedom—Under the Law." This inspiring article of Joel Sprayregen's is published in the April 26, 1963, Chicago Daily Law Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, Apr. 26, 1963]

OF DOGS AND FREEDOM—UNDER THE LAW (By Joel J. Sprayregen)

Law Day came a little early in front of the Leflore County Courthouse in Greenwood, Miss., last month. The principal celebrant was a giant police dog who left an enduring impression on the leg of a minister and, incidentally, on the minds of millions of people throughout the world.

It is regrettable that the pressure of his official duties will keep this dog from appearing with eminent jurists and leaders of the bar at Law Day observances throughout the Nation. The President's proclamation says that we need a Law Day for "our people to rededicate themselves to ideals of equality and justice in relations with one another." The amount of rededication necessary may be measured by the distance between the upper and lower jaws of the police dog.

As has always been customary in cases where a citizen is oppressed, the dog can plead that he was merely following orders. His master—a policeman sworn himself to follow orders and, if possible to enforce the laws of the land—ordered the dog to bite the leg of a minister who was peacefully demonstrating in the cause of securing the right to vote for his fellow citizens. In Greenwood, apparently, clergymen had better preach only where no one can hear them; as earlier authorities have noted, the Gospel

can be a disturbing thing if only men will open their hearts and minds to hear it.

The President's proclamation tells us that Law Day records "man's advance from savagery to civilization (with) reason and morality displacing brutal force." We may ponder that—although it is not recorded that dogs have an official "Law Day" of their own—the attack on the minister was not something that came naturally to the animal. Only after intensive training—presumably by human beings—is a dog sufficiently "educated" to attack instantly a man who has not threatened to do him wrong. This is certainly a significant accomplishment for higher education in Mississippi. But on Law Day, can we ask for something a little higher? Can we ask for education to ensure the prevalence of reason and morality over brute force?

Greenwood's premature Law Day festivities may remind us of more than the peril of the preacher who ventures into the gray pastures of public morality. As lawyers, it should remind us that when we take the case of the afflicted and oppressed—in Greenwood or Chicago—we act in the noblest of traditions. As a leading contemporary theologian says:

"The concern for justice is delegated to the judges, as if it were a matter for professionals or specialists. But to do justice is what God demands of every man: it is the supreme commandment and one that cannot be fulfilled vicariously. The calling of the prophet may be described as that of an advocate or champion, speaking for those who are too weak to plead their own cause. Indeed, the major activity of the prophets was interference, remonstrating about wrongs inflicted on other people. * * * The prophet is a person who is not tolerant of wrongs done to others."

We are not the first generation of lawyers called on to employ our ingenuity and courage in defense of the rule of law. St. Thomas More lost first his judgeship, and then his life, because he would not swear to an act which he believed was beyond the power of Parliament and the King. Lord Coke lost his judgeship by insisting that even kings are subject to the law. Have any lawyers ever drafted a more persuasive brief in defense of political freedom than the one in which Madison and Jefferson pledged for themselves and their colleagues, "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"?

In Illinois, Governor Altgeld lost his office because he believed that political passion was no ground on which to keep men in prison. A downstate Illinois lawyer shepherded his countrymen through a fratricidal bloodletting so that our best traditions of self-government "shall not perish from this earth." In 1910, the justices of our State supreme court (prophesying a case that 52 years later was to bring down grossly undeserved wrath on the U.S. Supreme Court) ruled that a Catholic schoolchild could not be compelled to recite from the Protestant Bible. And in Cook County, how many times has Clarence Darrow or the public defender or a member of the Defense of Prisoners Committee stepped to the bar in defense of, among other things, the finest traditions of the profession?

Almost half the world today celebrates a May Day whose heroes are, not lawyers dedicated to a rule of reason, but rather trained assassins and embittered theorists who never knew the responsibility and art of self-government under a rule of law. But our own traditions warn us not to be complacent about our achievements because the supreme commandment of justice "cannot be fulfilled vicariously." To each generation of American lawyers—and laymen—is given the responsibility of preserving freedom under law against the faint-hearted who would trade it for the illusory "security" of increased governmental power over the conscience and conduct of the individual citizen.

The responsibility must be met both inside and outside of courthouses in Mississippi, as well as in the North. It can be met not by quoting dead men, but only by taking risks to protect the liberty of living men.

Is there a despicable defendant who cannot secure a fair trial? Is there a schoolchild segregated because of his race or compelled by the State to recite a prayer in which he does not believe? Is there a policeman who tortures prisoners whom he believes guilty? Is there a judge who thinks contempt of court means any disagreement with him? Is there a mayor who thinks he can break up a peaceful demonstration for civil rights or peace or John Birch? Is there an American citizen who is not allowed to vote because his skin is black? Can a police dog's bark drown out, or his teeth crush, a plea for human dignity under law? Such cases are the crucibles in which are tested daily our faithfulness to the great tradition, and our right to have a Law Day.

Man, having subjected all the other animals on earth to his rule, now stands on the eve of conquering the infinite spaces of the universe. But can man subject himself to the rule of law? If he can, we can excuse police dogs from participation in our ceremonies, and let them have their own day. Man himself will then be worthy to proclaim Law Day throughout the universe.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be no business considered today.

It is anticipated that on Wednesday next the Senate will consider the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill; the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive offices appropriation bill; and also the unfinished business, S. 537, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday morning next.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE RE-ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

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

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorgani-

zation Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM AND PROPOSED FEED GRAIN LEGISLATION FOR 1964-65

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year when the administration's proposal for a mandatory feed grain bill—a bill which would have provided for a mandatory limitation on feed grain production—came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I opposed it and I offered an amendment to knock out the mandatory provision. My amendment succeeded in the committee by one vote. I opposed the mandatory provision again on the floor, but it passed the Senate by a very close vote. But it failed in the House, and was never enacted into law.

Now, the administration has had second thoughts on the kind of feed grain bill it feels would be best for the country. I commend the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States for recognizing that a mandatory program would not be desirable. I feel that it would not work, that it is not a practical approach. I think it would be most unfortunate for our agricultural economy.

Preliminary reports indicate that 25.8 million feed grain base acres will be diverted under the 1963 program as compared with a diversion of 28.6 million in 1962 and 25.2 million acres in 1961. For the entire United States feed grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 are only 90 percent of those diverted in 1962.

The central Corn Belt States of Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio all reported fewer than 90 percent as many feed grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 as in 1962. Iowa, Illinois, and Ohio, for example, will divert only 80 percent as many acres as in 1962. Indiana, Missouri, and Michigan will divert only 85 percent as many acres as in 1962. Other States which reported a greater than national average decline in acres intended for diversion in 1963 were Arizona, Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Texas.

There were 20 States, however, mostly in the Northeast, West, and South which reported more feed-grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 than in 1962. They are: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Georgia.

The number of farms participating in the 1963 program is slightly higher than in 1962 and about 10 percent higher than in 1961. Only nine States have fewer farms enrolled in the 1963 than in the 1961 program. The nine States are: Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, and Ohio.

Small farms appear to be participating in larger numbers in 1963 and some large farms may have dropped out. In

spite of the 10-percent increase in the number of farms participating in the program, the percentage of the total feed-grain acreage on farms participating in the 1963 program is lower than it was in 1961; and is only slightly higher than in 1962. In 1961, 59 percent of the base acreage of feed grains was on farms which participated in the program. In 1962 barley was also included in the program and the percentage of the total feed-grain acreage on the farms participating in the program dropped to 55.3. Preliminary estimates indicate that 56.7 of the feed grain base acreage is on the farms which are participating in the 1963 program.

The smaller acreage of corn, grain sorghum and barley intended for diversion in 1963 as compared with 1962 is the result of a higher proportion of small farms participating in 1963 and of less diversion per farm cooperating. The portion of the base diverted for payment on participating farms dropped from an average of 39.6 percent in 1961 and 42 percent in 1962 to 34.4 percent intended for 1963. In Iowa and Illinois the percentage diversion on the participating farms dropped from 34.7 percent in 1962 to 27 percent in 1963—a reduction of almost 20 percent in the proportion of the bases diverted on the participating farms. This is in line with the changed economic incentives in the 1963 program which provides less incentive for diverting more than 20 percent of the base acreage than was provided in the 1961 and 1962 programs.

One of the reasons why I opposed the program last year was that I thought the taxpayer would not get as much for his money, inasmuch as the incentive for the farmers to cut down on production was reduced, while the payments were increased.

COST COMPARISONS

Acreage diversion payments in 1961 were \$782 million; in 1962, \$842 million; and acreage diversion plus price support payments for the 1963 program are now estimated at \$872 million, which will be the highest to date. In addition to the payments to producers in 1961 and 1962 the Government took over 500 to 600 million bushels of corn at \$1.20 per bushel and substantial amounts of other feed grains at comparable loan values after selling certificated grain at \$1 to \$1.08 per bushel. Its losses on these feed grains probably amounted to \$100 to \$150 million each year. Under the 1963 program with the loan value of \$1.07 per bushel for corn—and other loan values in proportion—and a prohibition against selling certificated grain at less than the loan values, little if any 1963 feed grains are expected to be delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program.

Taking into account both the payments for diversion and the CCC losses on the new grains acquired under the 1961 and 1962 loans, it appears that the cost per acre diverted in 1963 will be about the same as the total cost per acre diverted in 1961 but 5 to 10 percent higher than in 1962.

As compared with the 1961 and 1962 programs, in 1963 the Secretary of Agri-

culture reduced acreage diversion payments from 50 to 20 percent of the value of the crop grown, raised the price-support level from \$1.20 to \$1.25 per bushel for corn, and made similar increases in the price-support level for the other feed grains. These changes were made to keep the total cost of the 1963 program in line with the cost of the 1961 and 1962 programs in view of the change in the legislation requiring compensatory price-support payments of 18 cents per bushel for corn, and for other feed grains in proportion.

Although the Government costs per acre diverted for the 1963 program will probably be 5 to 10 percent higher than total costs per diverted acre for the 1962 program, the market price of corn will be stabilized at a level 5 to 10 percent higher than in 1961 and 1962. The legislative authorization for the 1963 feed grains program provides that no certificated grains can be sold at less than the loan value, \$1.07 per bushel for corn, plus carrying charges. For this reason the market prices for the 1963 feed grain crops is expected to average higher than the equivalent of \$1.07 per bushel for corn. Most of the certificated grains from the 1961 program were sold on the basis of about \$1.02 per bushel for corn and most of those from the 1962 program have been sold for about \$1.07 per bushel for corn and market prices approximated these levels.

SOME UNCERTAINTIES

On the basis of the sharp reduction in feed grain carryover stocks achieved during 1961-62 and 1962-63, there has been widespread expectation that carryover stocks would be reduced to desired levels of about 45 million tons at the close of the 1963 feed grain marketing year, October 1, 1964. Even though farmers intend to plant 2.6 million acres more feed grains in 1963 than in 1962, if acre yields are lower as a result of less favorable weather, the desired reduction in stocks may be achieved. If, however, an upward trend in yields continues as in recent years, feed grain production in 1963, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture technicians, may be 8.5 million tons larger than in 1962. This is equivalent to over three-fourths the reduction in carryover stocks expected in 1962-63. In other words, it may take one or two more years of diversion programs similar to the 1963 program before stocks are reduced to desired levels.

If 1963 feed grain production is 8.5 million tons larger than in 1962, as now projected by USDA, it is improbable that the Commodity Credit Corporation will be able to sell all of its certified grain at the equivalent of \$1.07 per bushel plus carrying charges for corn. The Commodity Credit Corporation will have between 800 and 900 million bushels of grain covered by 1963 certificates to sell; yet, if 1963 feed grain production is as high as now projected, much less than this would be needed from CCC stocks to supplement current production in the 1963-64 marketing year. Under such conditions it is doubtful that market prices would be high enough to permit CCC to dispose of all its grains covered by certificates.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR 1964 AND 1965

This background indicates one of the reasons why I support the feed grain bill, now having hearings before our Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. We expect to report it this week, and take it up next week—and I refer to H.R. 4997—as passed by the House of Representatives. It provides for the continuation of a voluntary feed grains program for the 2 crop years 1964 and 1965. In this bill the Secretary of Agriculture is given sufficient authority to carry on programs combining the best features of the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs. He also is given authority to grant bases to new feed grain producers and to allow county committees to take into account factors in addition to 1959-60 feed grain acreage history in setting individual farm bases.

This proposal has been criticized by some persons, including myself, as providing too much discretion for the Secretary of Agriculture. I do think, however, in view of the background I have just discussed and the fact that no one can predict what kind of weather we are going to have, it is well to have considerable flexibility of action in the Secretary of Agriculture, so he can make payments in accordance with the crops which will develop and the weather which we will have.

Criticism of H.R. 4997, as amended, centers on two points. It is alleged, first, that it gives too much discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture, and second, if enacted and the wheat marketing quota referendum carries, wheat producers will be permitted to produce wheat on feed grain base acres to the disadvantage of established feed grain producers.

It is true that substantial discretion would be granted the Secretary of Agriculture. If it were desired, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry might provide additional legislative history guidelines, without opening the bill for amendments, either in their committee report or in debate on the floor of the Senate. Generally acceptable guidelines might be to the effect that the Secretary should offer a program each year which would be expected to maintain or increase producers incomes, cost no more per acre of feed grains diverted than the average of the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs, and make as rapid progress as possible in reducing feed grain stocks to desired levels. The desired level might be specified at 40 to 45 million tons if desired.

The criticism that passage of H.R. 4997 would result in the production of wheat on feed grain base acres overlooks the fact that, if wheat is grown on feed grain base acres, the producer first must have diverted a part of his feed grain base acres to conservation uses, as specified by the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the wheat grown on feed grain base acres, on the average, will produce no more feed than if the land were planted to a feed grain. The adverse effects on feed grain and livestock producers of the wheat-feed grain substitution clause in the 1962 Agricultural Act appear to be less than the probable adverse effects resulting from a defeat of wheat marketing quotas.

Another criticism of the passage of feed grain legislation at this time is the belief that it would be inadequate or ineffective if the wheat marketing quota referendum for the 1964 crop were defeated on May 21. Under H.R. 4997, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture could offer feed grain producers a program in 1964 which would assure all co-operators the announced price support level for their feed grains produced in 1964 at no greater total cost or cost per acre diverted than the average of the 1961-63 programs.

If the wheat marketing quota referendum is defeated, however, 200 million or more bushels of wheat may be produced in 1964 in excess of amounts that can be marketed through usual channels at home and abroad. This wheat in effect would be added to feed grain supplies and might result in little or no reduction in total grain stocks, even though 25 million feed grain acres or more were diverted to conservation uses under a 1964 feed grain program.

To sum up, I favor the proposal because, in the first place, it is voluntary. I think it is extremely important that it be a voluntary feed grain bill. I recognize that there may be too much discretion allowed the Secretary of Agriculture, and for that reason I would favor guidelines in the committee report so that there will be some restraint on the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly as to the payments he makes. In the second place, I think this bill contains provisions, in effect in 1961, 1962, and this year, which will provide for higher farm income. Finally, I think the bill will provide lower costs for the taxpayers.

I think any fair, dispassionate, and objective analysis will show that this program has cost about \$1 billion annually for the past 3 years. If we had not had provisions in the program for reducing production and if we had tried to maintain farm income anywhere near where it is, the cost would have been a great deal higher than it was, and would be higher in the future, than it will be if we pass this bill.

I am happy, as one who opposed the mandatory feed grain program proposed last year, to favor this bill. I am glad that compulsory proposal is out of the way this year and we can know what to expect in the coming 2 years, if this bill is passed.

SURE RISE IN INTEREST RATES DESTROYS ARGUMENT FOR TAX CUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished financial commentator, Sylvia Porter, discussed the inevitable fact that interest rates are going to rise continually, and probably very sharply, during this year and next year. Her analysis is as cogent and concise as any I have seen. She gives not one reason, but six for her statement: The economy is perking up. The Treasury is financing a huge deficit, and therefore is going to borrow larger sums of money. The Federal Treasury and the Federal Reserve is determined to finance the effort without inflation

which means to them with higher interest rates. The administration and the Federal Reserve System also feel that we must increase our interest rates, at least on Government operations, to keep money from flowing out of the country. Also the proposed tax cut is likely to put even more pressure on interest rates and drive them even higher.

I think this analysis is excellent. I happen to disagree with Sylvia Porter on the necessity for higher interest rates. I think a fair appraisal will show that we should make every effort to stop any rise in present interest rates. Also, this analysis establishes the fact that in addition to its other unfortunate consequences, a tax cut will shove interest rates up, faster and farther. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

INTEREST RATE RISE MAY BE ON WAY (By Sylvia Porter)

Every important financial-economic force in this country is now working to push interest rates up gradually in 1963-64.

This will mean that borrowers will pay a higher price for cash. The increases may be measured only in fractions, but on large sums borrowed for prolonged periods even a rise of one-fourth percent can run into big money.

This will mean that an investor in new bonds or mortgages will get a higher price for the cash he lends. Again, the increases may be measured only in fractions, but fractions can make an impressive difference in what you earn over a long period of time.

The chances that interest rates will go down in the months ahead are next to zero. At best they'll hold within this year's range. The greater probability is that they'll climb gradually from today's levels because:

1. The economy is perking up and this indicates a rising demand from private and public sources for funds to finance business expansion and modernization, homebuilding and home buying, installment purchases and a vast variety of other projects. There's plenty of credit available in our commercial banking system and in savings institutions now to meet foreseeable demands. There's no doubt that credit will be available for legitimate projects. But as the demand for money climbs to meet the supply, the pressure will be for a rise in the price of money. This always has been the pattern.

2. The Treasury will have to finance a huge deficit in the Federal budget in coming months. Just in July-December 1963, it will have to borrow between \$11 and \$13 billion. As the Treasury taps the market with its borrowings, it obviously will absorb an immense amount of money and this factor will help tilt interest rates upward.

3. While the Federal Reserve System will continue to supply funds to the banking system in order to avoid braking the economic advance, it will not "oversupply" the system. Flooding the money market with funds in a cycle of expanding business could lay the base for another inflationary spurt and this the Central Bank will fight.

4. Both the administration and the Federal Reserve System agree the deficits of this period should be financed in the least inflationary way possible—which means borrowing as much of the money as is feasible outside the banking system. To appeal to nonbank investors, the Treasury will may have to pay gradually higher rates on the securities it offers. It already is paying close to 3 percent for 90-day loans, over 4 percent on its long-term I.O.U.'s. It is a distinct possibility that in the future it will increase

the rate it pays on its savings bonds from today's maximum of 3 1/4 percent to, say, 4 percent, in order to attract more funds from little investors.

5. The administration and the Federal Reserve System also agree that our interest rate level is a crucial weapon in trying to curb the outflow of gold. Because for years we have been spending so much more abroad than we have been earning abroad, our foreign creditors have built up tremendous short-term balances here which they can send abroad at will and turn into gold. To keep our creditors willing to maintain their balances in short-term U.S. securities, the interest rates on those securities must be high enough to appeal to our creditors, and Washington recognizes this.

6. Assuming substantial tax cuts are voted and these add new vigor to our economy, the Federal Reserve System will have much more freedom to act to control the money supply in order to combat inflationary tendencies and to nudge interest rates toward levels deemed desirable to protect our gold supply and dollar.

But not one force is operating now to push interest rates down. Rather, all appear to be moving in the opposite direction.

PAYOUT AID TO TITO: YUGOSLAVIA AND RUMANIA TO BUILD DAM TOGETHER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been announced in the past few days that Yugoslavia and Rumania are going to build a huge dam, at enormous cost, for the benefit of both economies; and that construction will start this year.

This is another indication of the fact that Yugoslavia is moving closer and closer to the Communist bloc, moving closer and closer to Moscow orientation, and is adapting its economy to fit into the economy of other Iron Curtain countries.

In the article by Hans Benedict, of the Associated Press, I came across the following statement:

Details of the financing have not been disclosed. The Soviet Union may be a silent partner in the project. Russian ships transport 37 percent of tonnage in the Romanian-Yugoslav section of the Danube.

Mr. President, there have been debates in the past, and there will be again, over whether we should continue to give the large amount of foreign aid to Yugoslavia in the future that we have given to it in the past. We have given Yugoslavia more than \$2 billion in foreign aid. I understand we have given more aid to this country than to any other so-called neutral country in the world.

On the basis of the recent record of Yugoslavia, it is not a neutral country. It is a Communist country. Tito says so. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Yugoslavia, Rumania To Build Dam Together" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

YUGOSLAVIA, RUMANIA TO BUILD DAM TOGETHER

(By Hans Benedict)

VIENNA, AUSTRIA.—A gorge of torrential Danube waters between Yugoslavia and Rumania will be turned into a giant lake to help shipping and give the two countries the second biggest powerplant in Europe.

Under an agreement expected to be concluded next month, Yugoslav and Rumanian experts will start a joint \$300 million project in the Iron Gate Strait within 7 years. It calls for a dam and power station with an annual output of 10.7 billion kilowatt-hours, nearly as much as Russia's Volga River plant.

The dam will raise the level of the Danube upstream for about 75 miles, flooding the Rumanian town of Orsova and a dozen villages on both sides of the border. The population of 25,000 will be resettled.

The Danube, blue in the Johann Strauss waltz, is gray to most beholders. It rises in Germany and runs 1,750 miles, touching the capital cities of Vienna, Budapest, and Belgrade.

At the Iron Gate the river foams into whitecaps as it whirls over jagged rocks between cliffs 120 yards apart. Parts of old shipwrecks are still in the rocks.

The artificial lake is to hold more than 35 billion cubic feet of water. While the hydroelectric plant is to be financed by the two governments, another \$100 million will be contributed by other Danubian countries for a system of locks. The entire project is to be completed by 1972.

The feud between Yugoslavia and the Soviet bloc in the Stalinist era stalled cooperation. In early 1956, when Moscow-Belgrade relations were thawing again, Rumanian-Yugoslav talks began. The Hungarian revolution interrupted the talks again. They were eventually resumed in 1960.

Details of the financing have not been disclosed. The Soviet Union may be a silent partner in the project. Russian ships transport 37 percent of tonnage in the Rumanian-Yugoslav section of the Danube.

The raising of the water level will make Belgrade accessible to ships of up to 5,000 tons. The dam, 1,300 yards long and 160 feet high, also will serve as a road and railway bridge, cutting the distance between Belgrade and Bucharest.

Two other international Danube power projects have been shelved due to financial difficulties. One was a joint Austrian-Czecho-Slovak dam across the river between Wolfsthal and Bratislava. A Czecho-Slovak-Hungarian project of four dams also has been waiting since 1956 to be realized.

BIRMINGHAM CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the unhappy events of the last few days in Birmingham should shake the conscience and sense of justice of the American people. And when I speak of the American people, I do so not to isolate the people of Alabama for, although their officials may be supported by many of their people, I am sure that there are many Alabamans who do not support their extreme action.

The use of dogs against human beings—fellow citizens not charged with any serious crime against the government or their fellow man, but simply seeking their constitutional rights as citizens, and desiring equal treatment under the law as human beings—is reprehensible. Today the administration is seeking a truce, and a truce is needed to avoid further injury to life. But the sad point is that the administration must seek a truce, and cannot fully enforce the substantive rights for which Negro citizens are marching and demonstrating, because the administration has failed to seek legislative action which would give it the statutory authority

and means to support and enforce the rights that the Negroes claim and to which they are entitled.

These fellow citizens claim the equal right of voting guaranteed by the 15th amendment to the Constitution; they claim the right for their children to attend desegregated schools, held by the Supreme Court of the United States almost 10 years ago in the case of Brown against Board of Education of Topeka to be their right under the 14th amendment; they claim the equal right to use public facilities, whether in control of the Federal, State, or local government, and to the use of facilities in all forms of interstate commerce, all of which rights have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. They claim also the right to equal use of public businesses, licensed by the State and held out by their owners as available for public use.

We know that every municipality has the authority to prescribe limitations on parades and demonstrations, and it may be true that the Negroes who have been parading are in violation of these municipal ordinances. But it can hardly be argued that the purpose of these ordinances is to prevent fellow citizens from asking for their fundamental constitutional rights. And even though a truce may be secured, we cannot believe that these demonstrations will be ended until these constitutional rights are recognized.

This administration has at its disposal a voting rights law enacted under the administration of President Eisenhower. But the Civil Rights Commission has reported that the provision which enables referees to enroll Negro voters has been very little used.

Although President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell asked for authority to enable the Attorney General to intervene in the name of the United States in school desegregation cases to secure a speedier acceptance of the Brown case, this administration has not and apparently will not ask for this power. Such legislation would lift the unbearable financial burden of prosecuting suits from the backs of individuals and transfer it to the United States, where it belongs.

The right of access to private businesses has not yet been clarified. The issue is in the courts and in justice. I must say that I understand the administration supports this right. Nevertheless, the administration has taken no action in the Congress, as I believe it could, to secure the enactment of legislation holding—as Justice Harlan did in his dissenting opinion in the civil rights cases many years ago—that these businesses, being licensed by the States, come within the purview of the 14th amendment.

In that great civil rights case in 1883, Justice Harlan, the grandfather of the present Justice, wrote a dissenting opinion in which he advanced the position that, because the State licensed businesses that held themselves out for use by the public, they fell within the purview of the 14th amendment. I believe legislation to this effect would be constitutional. I believe that the Su-

preme Court, when it again comes to this issue, will support the position taken by Justice Harlan.

The net result of the failure of the administration to seek statutory authority is that it is today prevented from taking timely and positive action, within the framework of law, to secure the rights for which these citizens strive.

The need for the Federal Government to have statutory authority to deal with this type situation can be applied to the progress of school desegregation in individual school districts. If the administration had statutory authority, and if there were a refusal to obey the mandate of the Court to desegregate, our Government would intervene. If the administration would seek, as President Eisenhower sought, authority for the Attorney General to intervene in school desegregation cases, it would be acting before the fact—instead of after the fact, as it is compelled to do today.

I apply this reasoning also to the use of public businesses. Today, because Negroes are insisting upon their right—as they believe it to be—to use public businesses, and because there is a local ordinance against parading, the Federal Government finds itself sitting on the outside and must ask for a truce. If there had been a finding by the Supreme Court—or if legislation had been enacted by Congress that the States come under the 14th amendment with respect to businesses licensed for public use—then today the Federal Government would be acting in support of the right of access of these individuals, instead of being forced to seek a truce with the Alabama officials who are using force and coercion, water hoses and dogs against human beings.

I realize that enforcement of the law is difficult when it is opposed by many citizens of a community, for consent is an element in our system of law. But consent will not come easily unless there is enforcement of the law by the Federal Government, against officials as well as private citizens. This administration has rendered itself unable to intercede fully and effectively in the enforcement of the law because it has not sought statutory authority from Congress in school desegregation and public business cases.

I must say that this indictment lies not only against the administration but also against the Congress. While many civil rights bills have been introduced in Congress, the effort has not been made on the part of Members of either the House or Senate—and I include myself as one of them—to at least bring up for consideration those bills and take whatever time is necessary for their perfection and passage.

The two great parties, with the exception of some leaders, are paying lip service to the cause of civil rights. Under the administration of President Eisenhower, two civil rights bills were passed—and they were passed because his administration and the Republican leadership of the Congress, aided by Democrats deeply interested in civil rights, did not weaken in their efforts to secure their passage.

I dislike doing so, but I am sorry to say that I believe the purpose of the

Republican Party in the field of civil rights has deteriorated since President Eisenhower's administration. If there is any party which should be united on civil rights, it is the Republican Party. We are not split sectionally, and it cannot be charged of our party as it can of the Democratic Party, that it does not want to offend its southern wing. Yet, whether it is for the hope by candidates of gaining votes in a convention, or for the hope of electoral votes from the South in 1964, we are compromising the issue which brought the Republican Party into being.

Some in our party, in spite of such outrages as have occurred in Birmingham, and in other places in the country even outside the South, still maintain that the issues of civil rights are local ones to be resolved by the States. Such an argument would lead one to believe that Lincoln never argued that human rights and human dignity were national issues; that he never fought the same argument of Douglas that these issues could be determined locally—and on this argument made the Republican Party a national party, a party which moved the conscience of the country and the world.

I believe the South will have a two-party system, and a growing Republican Party, because its people know that will be best for their section and for the country. If our party uses the expedient argument of States' rights with respect to constitutional and human rights—in an effort to secure convention or electoral votes—it is possible we might win a few Southern States in 1964. But in the long run, such a position will destroy the Republican Party, and worse, it will do a great wrong because it will be supporting the denial of the constitutional and human rights of our citizens.

Mr. President, there are many civil rights bills before the Senate which could be acted upon. In what I have said, I do not wish to draw attention to any bills which I have introduced or intend to introduce. But I do intend to implement what I have said today by the introduction of proposed legislation which will meet some of the specific issues which I believe have played a part in the great drive of our fellow citizens to secure their constitutional and human rights.

ARBOR DAY COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the most important events on the spring calendar in Nebraska each year is the observance of Arbor Day at the home of J. Sterling Morton, the holiday's founder.

This year's observance on April 21 was no exception. The speaker was John Rees, a Lithuanian refugee who has become widely known for his fight against communism.

Reflecting on the decades throughout which Arbor Day has been marked at Nebraska City's beautiful Arbor Lodge, Mr. Morton's home which has for many years been a State park, I recalled the efforts in 1932 to obtain a commemorative stamp to mark the 60th anniversary

of Arbor Day and the 100th anniversary of the birth of J. Sterling Morton, one of the most distinguished Secretaries of Agriculture in our history.

Mr. Frank A. Bartling, longtime postmaster at Nebraska City, and one of the most ardent supporters of Arbor Day, conceived the idea for the stamp. He has favored me with his account of Nebraska City's efforts to obtain the commemorative stamp and the results thereof.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Bartling's history of the Arbor Day commemorative stamp printed in the RECORD.

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

ARBOR DAY COMMEMORATIVE 2-CENT POSTAGE STAMP ISSUE, NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR., APRIL 22, 1932

(History by Frank A. Bartling, postmaster, 1932)

New Year's Day, 1932, as I was finishing some routine postal work at my office and thinking of the postal business for the past year which revealed falling off in business in this city, thoughts came to mind as to stimulating interest in Nebraska City. My thoughts drifted to the dilemma of the chamber of commerce committee on Arbor Day in finding some new ideas on celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of J. Sterling Morton and the 60th anniversary of the founding of Arbor Day. The idea flashed to my mind that this town should secure a commemorative postage stamp issue for Arbor Day. On the spur of the moment, I hastily typed a brief note to Mr. J. H. Sweet, editor of the News-Press, suggesting that if his paper and the chamber of commerce would back the idea, this city could have a stamp issue for Arbor Day, April 22, 1932. I delivered the note with other news items of the post office that morning and received no response immediately. However, I had conveyed my ideas to Mr. M. R. Thorp, assistant postmaster, who at that time was chairman of the chamber of commerce and soon a small news item appeared in the News-Press mentioning the idea.

However, several prominent Nebraska citizens, Mr. J. W. Steinhart and Mr. N. C. Abbott, became enthusiastic over the plan and letters were written by the chamber of commerce and other citizens to the Post Office Department and the U.S. Senator R. B. Howell and Congressman John H. Morehead asking that this anniversary be given a commemorative stamp issue.

The Postmaster General replied that owing to other commemorative issues in 1932, especially the Washington Bicentennial, no Arbor Day 2-cent stamp could be issued. (This exchange of correspondence is in the files.)

Not willing to be defeated in such an historic cause, the chamber of commerce enlisted the support of Lincoln and Omaha chambers, in presenting strong pressure to bear on the Post Office Department, and on Senator Howell, Congressmen Morehead and Baldridge to get the issue. Several businessmen and myself sent letters to our Nebraska representatives. Senator Howell partially declined to assist because he had applied for a "Buffalo Bill" W. F. Cody commemorative stamp for North Platte, Nebr. On the other hand, Congressman Morehead became very interested in the issue and worked hard and with perseverance. He was given valuable help by Congressman Malcolm Baldridge, of Omaha. (Letters from Mr. Morehead from the files give evidence of his efforts.) After the first efforts from Nebraska City, Omaha, and Lincoln, the

status of the stamp issue remained quiet and dormant for about 4 weeks. I became restless and uneasy, so on Friday, March 11, I telephoned Mr. Morehead advising him that Nebraska City was urging progress and asked him to report status of the matter. The next morning, I received a reply by telegraph stating that the stamp issue was approved by the Postmaster General. (This correspondence is also in files.)

Then detailed instructions from the Third Assistant Postmaster General, Division of Stamps Office, began to be received at our office. Preparations were made at the local office for a heavy business. I had very much to do and worked hard for 6 weeks previous to the holiday and for several weeks following it, in order that the handling of such a large volume of business at our office would be taken care of with the least possible errors. Incoming letters inclosing coins, checks, drafts, and thousands of money orders, accompanied with letters of instructions accumulated. I soon realized that our regular force could not do the work alone and after exchange of correspondence with Post Office Department officials in Washington, I was assured that they would give us help and ample expense money to carry out the task.

Department officials had experience handling other commemorative stamp issues, so their letters gave me plain instructions how to proceed. Also experienced supervisors to help us were sent here from Washington, April 11. Mrs. Myrtle C. Shaughnessy (widow of former Second Assistant Postmaster General) and Charles Anderson, traveling mechanic of the Fourth Assistant Post Master General Office, arrived. Mr. Anderson brought a special canceling machine equipped with a cast-die, worded "Nebraska City, Nebr., April 22, 1932." Within a few days after the arrival of these two officials, came Mrs. L. P. Shawen from the office of M. L. Eideness, Jr., Chief, Division of Stamps. Mr. Eideness, Jr., was to be here for the holiday but was unable to attend and so sent his representative, Richard Breden, for that day. The last week before the holiday was an exceedingly busy one. Temporary postal workrooms were set up in three rooms on the second floor of the post office building, April 12, 10 days prior to the holiday. Then the entire Arbor Day stamp business was handled upstairs. Incoming mail was sorted downstairs and all Arbor mail taken upstairs. Mrs. Shaughnessy had charge of issuing stamps to extra clerks and had supervision of sales and cash. She bought stamps from the wholesale stock downstairs, sorted and reissued the stock to clerks engaged in affixing them to envelopes. Mr. Anderson took charge of the canceling machine and the dispatching and Mrs. Shawen handled correspondence and special business. Three hundred thousand Arbor Day 2-cent commemorative stamps were in the first shipment received here from Washington.

All during the Arbor Day stamp business, I worked long hours, including Sundays and was very tired out at the close. Extra clerks received 65 cents per hour and their pay for the time during this rush of business was from \$35 to \$101, and regular clerks received overtime pay. Assistant Postmaster Thorp and myself received no extra pay for our overtime and even the large increase in receipts failed to give us an increase in annual pay.

Stamp affixing to first day covers was not confined to post office or entirely to post office employees. Individuals had advertised in stamp magazines that orders would be taken for souvenir envelopes and mailing thereof, so several types of souvenirs were on sale. Some local dealers booked large orders and early on Arbor Day were at the stamp window when I opened the window at 5 o'clock in the morning on April 22, 1932, Arbor Day.

A number of stamp dealers came to the city and others in the East has engaged people in Nebraska City to take their orders to buy stamps here and affix them to souvenir envelopes which they shipped here for cancellation as first day covers.

The commemorative issue was authorized by Postmaster General Walter F. Brown on March 12, 1962, and Arbor Day came on Friday, April 22. Orders for stamps enclosing first day covers were first received in Nebraska City on March 20, and continued to come until April 22; the peak of the load was about April 14.

As temporary employees for this stamp issue, 22 persons were employed as extra help, the total payroll for these employees was \$1,499. First day sales in Nebraska City, 540,000 2-cent stamps; 279,409 pieces of mail matter went through the special canceling machine; 1,151 pieces special delivery mail; 51,000 airmail letters, and 610 pieces registered mail. All this required 59 pouches, these being dispatched on the holiday, April 22. Total money orders paid, 8,150, in amounts from 2 cents up. Our money order accounts were not completed until May 30. The total number of Arbor Day 2-cent commemorative stamps printed was 66,182,900, being sold over the United States the day after the issue in Nebraska City.

The Arbor Day stamp bears the picture of Ruth and Alvin Hall, Jr., children of Alvin Hall, employed in the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Washington, D.C. When it was necessary to furnish subject matter for the Arbor Day stamp, Hall's children consented to pose for it. It portrays the children planting a Japanese cherry tree in front of their Washington home. The engraver slightly altered the original photograph in order to make the picture suitable for stamp engraving.

On the day of the celebration, members of the Morton family came to Nebraska City as the honored guests. First guest to call at the post office, of the Morton family, were Mrs. Carl Morton, city, and her daughter, Mrs. Martha Morton Lattner, and daughter, Dubuque, Iowa. Mr. and Mrs. Joy Morton, his son, J. Sterling Morton and his son, Joy Morton 2d, and Betty Morton, granddaughter, all from Chicago, came to the office later in the morning. I escorted all the guests through the post office and explained to them the handling of mail. Mr. Joy Morton displayed a keen interest in the affair and he and his son asked questions and commented on the large amount of foreign mail. The party spent about an hour around the office and on leaving, Mr. Joy Morton complimented me on the success of the event.

Weather conditions were very favorable on the holiday. A large crowd came to the city and attended the tree planting ceremonies at Arbor Lodge and visited scenes of interest in the city. Many visitors from over the State were here.

The day closed with a banquet at Memorial Building attended by about 500 people.

The Morton family being guests of honor and naturally the center of interest, with Mr. T. W. McCullough, editor of the Omaha Bee-News, as speaker of the evening. His address was long, of the formal type, so a little tiresome to some listeners.

The interesting talk of the evening was by Mr. Joy Morton, who spoke reminiscently of the family during their residence here and some events of his boyhood days here. His son, J. Sterling Morton 2d, followed with a brief address.

ALBUMS OF RECORDS MADE BY FOUR U.S. MILITARY BANDS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the May 1963 issue of Footlight, the National Cultural Center's newsletter.

attention is drawn to the record albums recently made by the four U.S. military bands. The proceeds from the sale of these records will go to benefit the National Cultural Center.

As Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of the Cultural Center, pointed out in Footlight, the pressing of these records represents unique cooperation among widely diverse groups, including the RCA Victor Record Division of the Radio Corp. of America, the Department of Defense, the American Federation of Musicians, the American Federation of Television Artists, leading music composers, arrangers and publishers, the personnel of the military bands, and the people associated with the Cultural Center.

The selections included in the albums represent the standard songs which have become integral parts of our American musical heritage. The records will be a worthwhile addition to any music lover's collection, and the sale of the records will give every American the opportunity to make his or her contribution toward making the National Cultural Center a reality.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the May 1963 edition of Footlight, including the remarks of President Kennedy, recipient of the first pressings of the albums.

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

SERVICE BAND RECORDINGS

On May 1, recordings made by the four U.S. military bands—Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—went on sale to the public. This is the first time such recordings have been commercially available. On April 23, the first pressings of the albums were presented to President Kennedy in his office at the White House. Making the presentation were George R. Marek, vice president of RCA Victor Records, Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, National Cultural Center, and the four conductors; Lt. Col. Hugh Curry, U.S. Army; Lt. Col. Albert Schoepper, U.S. Marine Corps; Lt. Anthony Mitchell, U.S. Navy; and Capt. Harry H. Meuser, U.S. Air Force, for Col. George S. Howard, who was ill.

In accepting the records, the President said, "I want to express my appreciation to RCA for having made these recordings which, I understand, are unusually well done. I understand that the National Cultural Center will receive 95 cents on each album, and it will be a great help to the Center."

"In addition, I am very grateful to the Musicians' Union, which has waived all its interests and rights in this matter. This is the first time that the American military bands have gone into this area, and it has been done because of the strong feeling by the industry and by the union that the Cultural Center will serve the country as well as the performing arts."

"Most of all we are grateful to our country's military bands—the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—for recording the albums. I hope that everyone buys them. It will give people a chance to hear great band music and to make a contribution to the development of the Cultural Center, which belongs to Washington, which is part of the Nation. I will enjoy playing the records myself."

DESIGN AND PROGRAM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, imagine the following situation:

Robert S. McNamara points his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?" he asks. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replies. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," says Mr. McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

That conversation, of course, never took place. But it is used as the lead of a thoughtful editorial in the April 29 issue of Missiles and Rockets to make the point that as the president of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. McNamara would never have committed that company to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as William J. Coughlin points out in the editorial aptly titled, "The Fallible Man," as Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara seems to have no qualms about committing this Nation's future to a single design concept.

The editorial asks the question of what would have happened in World War II "if we had canceled the B-17 and built only the B-24; if we had canceled the P-51 and built only the P-47."

Mr. Coughlin writes:

We will always have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian Misses swept down across the Yalu.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "The Fallible Man," published in the April 29, 1963, issue of Missiles and Rockets.

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

THE FALLIBLE MAN

Robert S. McNamara pointed his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?" he asked. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replied. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," said McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

Secretary of Defense McNamara will be the first to assure you that no such conversation ever took place. If it had, the Ford Motor Co. today would be a financial shambles. Edsel was a dismal failure. Yet the project had been thoroughly analyzed by

some of the finest minds in the automotive business and given the go-ahead by the management of one of the most successful firms in the industry. These experienced businessmen, operating in a familiar environment, were whipped by the unknowns.

Why do we bring up the Edsel?

Because we are certain that Mr. McNamara, if he had been Ford president at that time, never would have committed his company's future to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as Secretary of Defense, he apparently has no qualms about committing his Nation's future to a single design concept.

As we study the philosophy of Defense Research and Engineering, we find men of high intelligence taking a highly unintelligent approach to the weapon systems which this Nation will need in the future. They seem convinced that until it can be proven absolutely that a total system will work, until all question-marks are answered, until all risks are eliminated, no go-ahead should be given for development of a given project. Once committed to that philosophy of certainty, it is only a brief step to the belief that you need only one design. If you are so certain the first will work, why build two?

Show paper proposals to a scientist and he can assure you, after study, that one is more likely to succeed than another. Show them to an engineer and he'll tell you that the best way to find out is to build both of them and test them.

The dangers in our defense organization today lie in the fact that the heavily scientific organization of Defense Research and Engineering is making decisions that more practical engineers would decline to make without testing of hardware.

Today, as we have pointed out before, three-fourths of the new projects under study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff come down from D.D.R. & E.—a complete reversal of previous years when proposals flowed largely from the more practical minds of men in the military and industry.

We are told that the new single-design approach is necessary because weapon systems today are so costly that we cannot afford to embark on two parallel projects. We say the reverse is true; we cannot afford to abandon dual approaches—due to the simple fact that once wholly committed to the wrong road it becomes impossible to turn back because of the sheer size of the financial outlay already made. The cost of today's projects makes it imperative that dual approaches be explored before commitment to the entire weapons system.

Why not explore both Gemini and Dyna-Soar technology? Why not explore two TFX prototypes? No one can say now that one approach or another will be the successful one—paper studies just won't do the job.

There would be no problem, of course, if we had an infallible man as Secretary of Defense, one who could count on his advisers always to give him the correct advice and one who could always make the right decision.

Let's turn back the pages of recent aviation history and muse on what a single design approach might have done for the Nation's well-being.

Turn back to the days just before World War II. Paper proposals for two fighter planes are being studied by Defense Research and Engineering.

"It is quite apparent," says a high Defense official, "that we don't need both these fighter aircraft. One will do. Cancel the P-38. We'll build only the P-39."

A few weeks later, more proposals are laid on his desk.

"Why should we go into two costly bomber programs?" he asks. "Cancel the B-17. We'll build only the B-24."

Months pass.

"Cancel the P-51," he says. "We'll build only the P-47."

We leave to those with more imagination the ruminations on what course World War II might have taken if we had been forced to fight it without the P-38, P-51, and B-17. The Nation certainly might have saved a great deal of money and won the war quite handily, of course, if we had possessed a high Defense official who unerringly could have selected the P-38, P-51, and B-17 and canceled the less successful alternatives. No such man existed then and none exists today.

We always will have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian Migs swept down across the Yalu.

When it comes to military weapons, this Nation cannot afford to guess. We must explore all alternative approaches to the furthest point in hardware that we possibly can afford. We must not let fallible man make irrevocable decisions.

We hope Mr. McNamara remembers the Edsel.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate, S. 537, will provide for a more effective evaluation of budget requirements of executive agencies of the Federal Government.

Both historically and legally, one of the major functions of Congress—if not our most important single one—is that of controlling Federal spending and taxing, and the financial policies of the Government.

Yet I do not believe we are performing that function adequately today. In passing on Federal appropriations, we proceed primarily on the basis of the proposals made to us by the President, rather than creating our own policy guides. The initiative is left with the President, although theoretically Congress has the power to control. Furthermore, even when it comes to passing on the details of appropriations for each program and bureau, we rely largely on the analysis and data presented to us by the agency itself and by the administration's Budget Bureau, rather than developing our own material.

The bill S. 537, which would establish a joint congressional Committee on the Budget, is intended to repair that situation by providing us with the means for doing our own analysis of requested appropriations, of preparing our own material on the budget, and developing our own policies to control Federal financial policies. The proposed joint committee would have a small staff to carry on the kind of study and analysis to which reference is made. As I envisage it, this joint committee would operate in a manner similar to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which provides expert technical assistance to both the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Committees.

It is recognized that at present both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees have highly efficient staffs, but in practice the men on those staffs must necessarily devote full time to the processing of the particular appropriation bills to which they are assigned. The staff of the proposed new joint

committee would have time to carry on studies of longer range and broader scope, including those which cut across individual appropriation bills.

Creation of this new joint committee would not be a radical departure from the kind of arrangement Congress has already created with respect to other matters. Furthermore, it would not infringe on the prerogatives of either House, since the joint committee and its staff would remain firmly under the control of members of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses.

Spending has skyrocketed in the last few years. For fiscal year 1962, President Eisenhower requested new oblique authority of about \$81 billion. For fiscal year 1964, we have been asked to approve new oblique authority amounting to \$108 billion. This is an increase of \$27 billion or 33 1/3 percent in the short span of 2 calendar years.

I submit that Congress is obligated to improve its machinery for coping with administration requests for appropriations, if we are seriously to claim that we control the purse strings of the Government. Enactment of Senate bill 537 will be an effective step for improvement in this regard.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to join in the comments made by the senior Senator from Nebraska concerning Senate bill 537. I wish to associate myself with his views, and to make a comment on that subject.

Mr. President, the cosponsorships of Senate bill 537 by 77 Members of the Senate indicates that the merits of this bill are generally recognized. A long discussion of it by a new cosponsor is, therefore, unnecessary. Nevertheless, I wish to take the occasion to comment on the chief sponsor of the bill and to make a brief observation on the proposition before us.

I am persuaded that the Senate and the Nation owe the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] a vote of deep appreciation for his constant and consistent support of the cause of an effective Congress. His efforts since 1950 to secure the enactment of this particular bill typify his determination to accomplish that which he believes is right and necessary.

Mr. President, regardless of whether our colleagues at the south end of the Capitol see fit to pass this measure this year or in a subsequent year, we have a clear obligation again to make an expression on this matter.

On the bill itself, I should like to make one point which in my judgment justifies enactment of the bill: If Congress is to remain a constructive, effective, and coequal branch of our National Government, Congress must exercise an informed and independent judgment concerning the volume, the direction, and the priority of our national efforts. The most effective participation this branch possesses is in connection with its ability and its duty to control the flow of money to the administrative agencies. Our best intentions will not be satisfied, nor will the Nation's interests be served, if we cannot assure proper utilization of the

vast financial resources which we siphon from the pocketbooks of the citizens and redirect through Government programs.

I have heard it said that the best way to learn one's way around a strange city is to drive a taxicab. In similar manner, I suggest the best way to learn one's way around Government is to try to trace what happens to the tax dollars. There is no better way to know and to understand the Government than to know where its money comes from and where it is spent.

All Members of this body have a sincere desire to act from an informed position upon the many issues which confront us. As I seek to understand the budget, I must say that the one-way streets and dead end streets, the detours, and the stop lights make the task far from easy. The budget document, while neatly assembled, is not always a helpful roadmap. I am sure the frustration I have experienced in this area is shared by many of my colleagues.

This condition—the size and the complexity of our Government and the size and complexity of our national budget—is worthy of our serious attention.

I would hope that as a result of the work of the proposed joint committee, we would have available data compiled independently of that furnished by witnesses and administering agencies. Often we are in the position of having to judge an issue based upon the evidence and the case submitted only by the proponents. Honorable as their intentions may be, we should not be compelled to rely upon only such evidence.

I would anticipate frequent evaluations of continuing programs. Very frequently we direct our analysis to programs which are new or call for increased funds, whereas programs with fairly constant fiscal demands are not as carefully scrutinized for value received or for their need to exist at all.

Certainly we need more realistic projections of the future cost of new programs. We are in the habit of starting a new program of nominal cost, only to find that the first appropriation is just "seed" money. These programs later return to us, and demand more support. We should know what we are getting into, and we should be in a position to provide to the administration guidance regarding our future intentions. This can be done by having available to the Congress and to the administration detailed projections, as part of our legislative record.

We should have available a realistic view of authorized spending. Each year we authorize vast programs. It may be that these authorizations are easily passed because it is understood that the actual appropriation of money is not involved. We assume that the appropriations process will protect the taxpayers. We need to have a better understanding of what we are committed to and of how real these obligations are.

Mr. President, in my opinion, these are a few of the very real needs which a joint committee on the budget and a competent staff will satisfy.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFRICA AND THE EMERGING NATIONS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful analyses of the shortcomings of our current policy toward Africa and the emerging nations is contained in a recent article written by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [MR. GOLDWATER].

In the blunt terms which are characteristic of the Senator, he maintains that "as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all."

No one can quarrel with that statement. Clearly, as Senator GOLDWATER suggests, now is the time for a fresh approach to the problem, and a rethinking, and perhaps discarding, of some of our outmoded notions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator GOLDWATER'S "How Do You Stand, Sir?" column, distributed by the Los Angeles Times Syndicate for April 11.

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

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR? (By U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Our entire African foreign policy needs a careful reexamination. For, as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all.

The United States opposes colonialism in Africa. Unquestionably, this is right in theory. But in practice, some unpleasant developments have arisen.

Since 1956, 27 new African countries have been admitted to the United Nations. Most of these are in economic trouble, despite aid from the European countries which formerly ruled them. Almost without exception, the economic situation in the new states has deteriorated. Moreover, the trend toward dictatorship and personal rule is marked, as the personal extravagance and inflationary policies of many of the rulers and their entourages have been.

Equally disturbing is the nationalism and extremism in most of the new states. Anti-European sentiment is strong and seems to be rising all over Africa.

Kenya, the British colony, is not yet free, but already the white farmers are leaving. The chances are heavy that their property will be expropriated.

Freedom for the Belgian Congo was followed by outbreaks of violence which resulted in atrocities and murders and destruction of property. The exodus of the Europeans which followed that declaration of independence is one reason for the sorry state in which the Congo finds itself today.

There is such a thing as freedom too soon. This is exemplified in the Belgian Congo and in some other states as well. The Belgians claim we put pressure on them to get out of the Congo, and now it is fully apparent that the Congo was not ready to run its own affairs. Informed leaders claim the chaos there is likely to continue for a number of years.

Meanwhile, the United States has committed itself to back the Congo Government. Already we have put many millions of dollars into the country, one way or another. The total sum in 1962 was over \$200 million. We will, of course, give the Congo much more before we are through.

Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the Congo, is openly supporting a movement to drive the Portuguese out of the nearby Province of Angola. He has donated land for a camp which is training troops for an invasion of Angola. The men are being supplied with arms by Ben Bella, the Algerian leader who pledged his support to Castro right after he visited the United States to engage in foreign aid talks.

If we permit Adoula to carry out his plans, it will amount to our assisting an attack on the Portuguese, since we are Adoula's principal backer. And because Angola is no more ready for self-government than was the Congo, the eviction of the Portuguese from that Province will simply give us one more country to support.

Many of the new African States are too small to be viable. Others lack the necessary resources. Experts say there are only about five states with the area and resources required to permit them to take care of themselves. These are Nigeria, the Congo, Ghana, Tanganyika, and the Sudan. But these sorely need the technical and administrative skills of the whites, as do the other new African nations.

Today, the drive against colonialism in Africa continues unabated. As it moves into South Africa, it encounters increasing resistance. The problems multiply and increase in size.

So, I suggest, the time has come for us to take stock of our policies. Perhaps the time has come to try out some basis for cooperation between whites and natives before we insist that the whites abdicate entirely, for it has become obvious that a satisfactory working relationship between the races is necessary for any real African progress. Our present policy is not providing such a relationship.

How do you stand, sir?

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these days when big government seems to be steadily growing bigger, many of us are concerned to know just how the role of government in our life is to be defined. There would appear to be no better definition than that given by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON in his speech before the "Forum of the Future," at Charleston, W. Va., on Thursday, April 25, 1963.

Taking his cue from the West Virginia State motto, "Mountaineers Are Always Free," the Vice President described government as mankind's most powerful—and most fallible—creation. As developed by freemen, it is and must always remain a servant of the people. Better government, he pointed out, not simply more government, is our aim. The success of our Union is due, Vice President JOHNSON said, to the fact that it has never attempted to exert any power other than that granted to it freely at the polls.

Reviewing the jealous guarding of freedom in the Mountain State's first 100 years, the Vice President boldly envisioned the role of government in the next 100 years as a four-pronged instrument for achieving social progress by means of education, exploration of space, expansion of our economy, and conservation of natural resources.

Because the role of government is such an important question in all of our minds

today, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By LYNDON B. JOHNSON)

One hundred years ago—on June 20, 1863—the State of West Virginia was admitted to the Union. In that year, the soil of our land ran with tragic blood as American fought American as an outgrowth of their differences over what the role of government should be.

The topic assigned to me for this "Forum of the Future" has been—and continues to be—the most controversial, the most divisive, and the most nearly continuous issue of our national life from the Continental Congress to the present.

Whether we speak of the Nation, of an individual State, or of any of the local areas served by the 91,000 constituted governments of our land, we cannot look into the future and say with confidence what the role of government will be 100 years, 10 years or even 1 year hence. This question is answered anew each time the people vote. This process is one of the great sources of strength of our system—and of our freedoms.

Government is mankind's most powerful invention. It is also among the least perfect and most fallible of his works. Many more governments have failed than have succeeded. Our own—still less than 200 years old—has outlived virtually every government which existed at the time of its formation, largely because of the constant scrutiny it received—at all levels—by people jealous of their liberties.

This spirit has a long history in West Virginia. Inhabitants of these mountains petitioned the British Crown for self-government long before the Colonies declared their independence. West Virginians have given more than lip-service to the slogan, "Mountaineers Are Always Free."

The American view toward government was well expressed more than 100 years ago in a story related by the writer and philosopher, Henry Thoreau. In his Journal, Thoreau related this personal experience: "I went to the store the other day to buy a bolt for our front door, for as I told the store-keeper, the Governor was coming here. 'Aye,' said he, 'And the legislature, too.' 'Then, I will take two bolts,' said I. He said that there had been a steady demand for bolts and locks of late, for our protectors were coming."

(Of course, I trust the Governor and the members of the legislature who are present will bear in mind that Thoreau did not have the privilege of living in West Virginia.)

I believe the point is made. When we consider the question of the role of government, we consider the question which has provoked the strongest feelings of Americans through the years—and we establish the one fact which underlies our discussion here. That is the fact that for the next 100 years, the role of government in West Virginia—and in the Nation—will be determined by the will of the people themselves.

As Governor of the State of New York, a very great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said more than 30 years ago: "The duty of the state toward its citizens is the duty of the servant to its master."

Our present debates on the role of government are obsessed with issues of size and cost. Some regard big government as an end in itself. Others believe big government is an evil in itself. The many details of these debates are unlikely soon to be settled. If we have settled on any national consensus about the role of government,

however, it is upon the concept of government as servant—rather than as master.

Government is not made benevolent or tyrannical by its smallness or its bigness. The decisive test is performance. Government is good—or it is not good—in proportion as it performs what the people need it to perform: neither less nor more, neither too little nor too much.

In the earlier years of this century, Samuel Gompers, when asked what labor wanted, answered with a single word: "More." If many Americans today were asked what they wanted of government, their instinct might be to answer: "Less."

But big government is a fact of our national life. In 1929, the transactions of government—Federal, State, and local—represented less than 10 percent of our gross national product. At the start of this decade, such transactions accounted for nearly 30 percent. We cannot dismiss this size, the rate of growth, or the broad implications of the relationship of governmental policies to our whole economy and society. But we can insist—we must insist—that the very dimensions of government's present role be accompanied by better performance as our servant.

In the century of West Virginia's statehood, we have evolved the concept that if government is to be the faithful and effective servant of the people, its first—and foremost—service must be to the people's future. A responsible concern for the future has been a distinguishing characteristic of government in America. This concern has been expressed in four principal areas of activity: exploration, expansion, education, and conservation.

From the expedition of Lewis and Clark to the orbital flight of John Glenn, American government has been distinguished by an intelligent willingness to support and encourage exploration and discovery.

From the Homestead Act of 1862 to the incentives of the Revenue Act of 1962, American Government has concerned itself with stimulating expansion for both individuals and businesses. As early as 1787, when John Adams and Thomas Jefferson set aside 1 lot in every 10 in the Northwest Territory for the support of education, American Government has honored a commitment to the future through a commitment to the education of our young.

Since the earliest years of this century, American Government—both Federal and State—has prudently assumed responsibility for conservation of our endowment of natural resources—and, in this prudent tradition, Government has undertaken a parallel responsibility to conserve and utilize more fully our human resources.

While we cannot prophesy far into the future what future generations will want the role of Government to be, I believe we can expect—and predict—continuation of these principal directions of public policy and governmental responsibility.

What will be the meaning for West Virginia?

The Mountain State, 100 years ago, elected to cast its lot with the Union. That decision then is symbolic for today. The future of West Virginia is inseparable from the future of the Union as a whole. Yet, in saying this, I realize that West Virginians may justifiably ask if this is so of the future, why has it not been so of the present and the immediate past.

In times of virtually universal American prosperity and growth, West Virginia has not shared equally in the national advance. The number of jobs has dwindled. Farm income has declined for your 43,000 farms. The number of businesses has decreased to 25,000.

Income per capita has fallen to less than 80 percent of the national average.

In this regard, I was interested to find—to my surprise—that despite these trends, there are twice as many persons in West Virginia owning and holding stocks on the New York Stock Exchange than in my own State of Texas.

The experiences of recent years might justify West Virginians adopting the philosophy of Mr. Dooley, who said: "Anyhow, there is always one ray of light ahead—we're sure to have hard times."

While such a philosophy might seem justified, at this start of West Virginia's centennial observance, we neither accept such an attitude nor believe it. On the contrary, we view the future from an exactly opposite perspective. As a nation, we accept as our responsibility the proposition that Americans of every State must be sure of good times ahead.

The fate which has befallen West Virginia in recent years was not determined within the borders of your State. It was determined by events and forces in other States, in the entire Nation, and even in the world.

Developments in our own Southwest and the distant Middle East—developments as near as the coal markets of the mid-Atlantic and as far as the Common Market of Europe—had their consequences and effect upon the enterprise, the jobs, the homes and, finally, even the food on the plates of West Virginians.

The people of the United States have, through the policies of their Government, made a commitment to the individual and his well being. In the lesson of West Virginia, we have learned that Government cannot meet this commitment merely by being ready to write a check. Government must perform more than the role of an automated charity.

In this interdependent world, good times for the individual American can only be assured as individual human beings throughout the world enjoy better times for themselves.

West Virginia's per capita income is, as I have mentioned, below the average of all States. But at the level of about \$1,800 annually, the income of West Virginians compares as the wealth of millionaires to the income of most of the earth's population.

In only six nations, including our own, is the income level over \$1,000 a year. In only a few others does it exceed \$500 a year. Most of the world's population lives for a year on no more than a single weekly paycheck of an American industrial worker.

We have learned in this 20th century that we could not isolate ourselves from military aggressors of the world. Today, we are learning—or ought to be learning—that we cannot isolate ourselves or the domestic economy from the aggressors of poverty or privation in the world. Either the living standards of the world must rise toward ours or our own standards will fall toward those of the world.

One of the lessons we have learned in West Virginia applies also to the world. We have learned that America cannot assure better times for the world merely through the use of our checkbook.

Vastly more is required of responsible government than that it be a checkwriting machine. The standards of government—whether its relative size be large or small—demand able and courageous performance in the four realms I have mentioned: exploration, expansion, education and conservation.

In the next 100 years, government's role in these areas will be active and important. The objective of all that is done will be to

improve life for the individual here on earth.

We explore space. Our objective is far more than to reach the moon. Our space effort will require the fullest use of our resources, bringing new and higher uses for the natural wealth of West Virginia, creating better jobs and higher paying jobs for your people and the people of all the States. But the fruits of our space technology will open opportunity worldwide.

We seek to foster expansion—expansion of industry, the building of plants, the expansion of research and distribution. But even more, we seek expansion of the good life for all our people—the building of better homes, increasing profitability of farms, opening new doors of opportunity to all people regardless of race, religion or national origin.

We seek to foster conservation. We must continue the prudent preservation of our natural resources and achieve the fuller development of our inland rivers, our water power, our timberlands and our soil. We must keep the air we breathe and the water we drink clean and healthful. But we must also conserve the great wealth of our human resources—eliminating the scrapping of human talents because of age or illness or mental retardation or lack of skills.

Above all, we must continue the American commitment to education. What we are as a nation, and what we have been able to achieve as a people, is the dividend of our investment in the minds of our youth. Our leadership in the world—the fate of freedom itself—will be determined by how we honor our commitment to education. But even more, the kind of life our people know will flow from our investment in education the next 10 years and the next 100 years.

In the first years after World War II, we in America permitted and even encouraged our government—at all levels—to limit its role to the service of the present. The consequences have been many. West Virginia is case example No. 1. We know now—better than we have known before—that government must fill the role of serving the future or else its burden becomes oppressive and the opportunities of the people decline.

In these next 100 years, government must assume a much more vigorous role in the level-headed pursuit of peace.

Government must open wider the door of choice for individuals.

Government must help the people to marshal to the fullest their resources of earth and spirit.

The role of government must in this next century be more than ever the role of faithful servant faithfully serving the future. We must measure its performance less by its costs than by its accomplishments in supporting the greater liberty of all the people.

The traditional American view that government requires constant scrutiny remains a healthy view but we must not lose sight of one thing.

The tyranny of communism has not been able to extend its reach beyond the march of its foot soldiers. Yet, the idea born on these shores—the idea of servant government serving the people—has leaped oceans, swept continents, inspired millions to seek independence and has been the great moving force of this century.

We are creators and possessors of an instrument of infinite good in the role of government we have conceived in America. While we remain vigilant against its abuses, exacting in our standards for its performance, we should, at the same time, respect it and work with it, realizing that its success alone will be our salvation. The fundamental role of our Government these next 100 years—in West Virginia, in the Nation, and in the world, must be to achieve progress for all the people, greater prosperity for all humankind, and, finally, to achieve peace among men forevermore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. WEDNESDAY, MAY 8

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, May 8, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1963:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Edmond T. Daly, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years vice Randolph C. Richardson, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, U.S. Air Force, to be reappointed as Chief of Staff of the Air Force for a term of 1 year.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Adm. David Lamar McDonald, U.S. Navy, to be appointed as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy for a term of 2 years.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

I nominate Lt. Gen. Robert B. Luckey, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. James P. Berkeley, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

IN THE 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 3299:

To be major, Medical Corps

Fichtner, John Z., XXXXX.

To be captain

Abene, Gasper V., XXXXX.

Abrahams, Edwin G., XXXXX.

Abamoski, Leo B., XXXXX.

Abt, Irwin E., XXXXX.

Adams, George B., XXXXX.

Adams, Jack E., XXXXX.

Adams, James E., XXXXX.

Adcock, Thomas G., XXXXX.

Addicott, Charles W., XXXXX.

Aicken, Larry B., XXXXX.

Ainsworth, Robert L., XXXXX.

Akin, George H., XXXXX.

Akiyama, Frank M., XXXXX.

Albright, Anthony F., XXXXX.

Alexander, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXX.

Alford, John R., XXXXX.

Allen, Boyd W., Jr., XXXXX.

Allen, Robert C., XXXXX.

Allison, Robert H., XXXXX.

Alzheimer, Robert H., XXXXX.

Alston, Pontha D., XXXXX.

Alton, Gary O., XXXXX.

Amerson, Hinton S., XXXXX.

Amos, Julian E., XXXXX.

Anderson, Curtis E., Jr., XXXXX.

Anderson, David P., XXXXX.

Anderson, Joseph L., XXXXX.

Andreacchio, Nicholas A., XXXXX.

Apperson, Jack A., XXXXX.
Archer, James H., XXXXX.
Areheart, Henry W., Jr., XXXXX.

Argo, James W., XXXXX.

Armstrong, Hart R., XXXXX.

Armstrong, James S., Jr., XXXXX.

Arnold, John M., XXXXX.

Arnold, Robert W., XXXXX.

Aschettino, Richard F., XXXXX.

Bachmann, Robert R., XXXXX.

Baeb, David E., XXXXX.

Bagnaschi, Albert L., Jr., XXXXX.

Bailey, Clarence A., XXXXX.

Bailey, George W., 3d, XXXXX.

Baird, Richard J., XXXXX.

Bakeman, Charles D., XXXXX.

Baker, Robert M., Sr., XXXXX.

Baldwin, Richard B., XXXXX.

Baldwin, Robert C., XXXXX.

Balint, Barry T. J., XXXXX.

Bane, Wista F., Jr., XXXXX.

Banks, James C., XXXXX.

Banner, Thomas A., XXXXX.

Barbazette, John H., XXXXX.

Barber, James J., XXXXX.

Barborak, Franklin D., XXXXX.

Barisano, Louis, XXXXX.

Barker, Harold S., Jr., XXXXX.

Barker, Rex N., XXXXX.

Barlow, Donald J., XXXXX.

Barnard, Roy S., XXXXX.

Barnum, Robert C., XXXXX.

Barrett, Jonathan R., 3d, XXXXX.

Barrett, William T., XXXXX.

Barry, Arthur A., XXXXX.

Bartlett, Gerald T., XXXXX.

Bassett, Gordon C., XXXXX.

Baumeister, Harold J., XXXXX.

Baun, Richard A., XXXXX.

Bayruns, Paul C., XXXXX.

Beasley, Benjamin E., XXXXX.

Beaulieu, Gary P., XXXXX.

Beaver, Joseph M., XXXXX.

Beavers, Guy M., XXXXX.

Beben, Joseph A., XXXXX.

Beck, Frederick S., XXXXX.

Beckwith, Robert E., XXXXX.

Beckwith, Robert B., XXXXX.

Beitz, Charles A., Jr., XXXXX.

Bell, Raymond E., Jr., XXXXX.

Bell, William E., XXXXX.

Bennett, Ferrell R., XXXXX.

Bennett, Lester E., XXXXX.

Berg, George A., XXXXX.

Bergson, Richard W., XXXXX.

Berner, John J., XXXXX.

Berry, William W., XXXXX.

Bethke, Gerald H., XXXXX.

Bezemek, Ludwig A., XXXXX.

Biberstein, Billy J., XXXXX.

Bickley, James B., XXXXX.

Bieri, Leon D., XXXXX.

Billey, John J., XXXXX.

Binder, Fremont E., XXXXX.

Bingham, Ellis D., XXXXX.

Bird, Max R., XXXXX.

Bishop, Donald E., XXXXX.

Bishop, Joseph A., XXXXX.

Bisping, Jack F., XXXXX.

Bizzell, Wold G., XXXXX.

Blakeley, David C., XXXXX.

Blaker, William J., XXXXX.

Blanck, John E., XXXXX.

Blank, James N., XXXXX.

Blank, Lyle E., XXXXX.

Blascak, Donald W., XXXXX.

Bledsoe, Edward P., XXXXX.

Bloomfield, John E., XXXXX.

Boiani, Peter J., XXXXX.

Bolvin, Arcade G., XXXXX.

Bokovoy, Jon E., XXXXX.

Boll, Albert F., XXXXX.

Bolt, Richard R., XXXXX.

Bomar, Hobby J., Jr., XXXXX.

Bone, Aubra N., XXXXX.

Bonilla-Acevedo, Tomas, XXXXX.

Bonner, Benjamin J., 3d, XXXXX.

Bonta, Stanley G., XXXXX.

Booth, John P., 3d, XXXXX.

Borer, Robert S., XXXXX.

Borgstrom, Richard O., XXXXX.

Bostancic, James F., ██████████.
 Boswell, Leonard LeR., ██████████.
 Bourland, James M., ██████████.
 Bowden, John J., ██████████.
 Bowen, Cecil R., ██████████.
 Bower, George L., ██████████.
 Bowman, Donald C., ██████████.
 Boyanowski, John G., ██████████.
 Boyle, Ernest W., ██████████.
 Boyle, James A., ██████████.
 Braa, Emery W., ██████████.
 Bradley, Robert E., ██████████.
 Brann, Travis L., ██████████.
 Brannen, Barney L., Jr., ██████████.
 Breckheimer, Donald G., ██████████.
 Breitenberg, Edward P., ██████████.
 Brickhouse, Willie T., Jr., ██████████.
 Briggs, Charles F., ██████████.
 Briggs, Thomas J., ██████████.
 Brill, James H., ██████████.
 Brister, Delano R., ██████████.
 Britt, Albert S., 3d, ██████████.
 Brittain, Richard T., ██████████.
 Britton, James H., ██████████.
 Britton, John A., ██████████.
 Brock, Jeffrey D., ██████████.
 Brockway, Lawrence N., Jr., ██████████.
 Bronson, Richard M., ██████████.
 Broome, James R., XXXXX.
 Brown, Fred D., ██████████.
 Brown, Lee D., ██████████.
 Brown, Leonard T., ██████████.
 Brown, Richard W., ██████████.
 Brown, Robert M., ██████████.
 Brown, Roy A., ██████████.
 Brown, Terry W., ██████████.
 Brudvig, Dale K., ██████████.
 Bruner, Robert J., ██████████.
 Bruskiewicz, Glenn L., ██████████.
 Bryan, Richard L., ██████████.
 Bryant, James W., ██████████.
 Bryant, Thomas E., Jr., ██████████.
 Bryant, William L., ██████████.
 Bryden, John M., ██████████.
 Brylla, Charles W., ██████████.
 Buchan, Alan B., ██████████.
 Buck, Champlin F., 3d, ██████████.
 Buckner, David L., ██████████.
 Buckner, Donald A., ██████████.
 Budd, Alexander S., Jr., ██████████.
 Buddo, James S., Jr., ██████████.
 Bue, Paul A. J., ██████████.
 Buel, Charles J., ██████████.
 Burberry, John W., Jr., ██████████.
 Burgdorf, Carl F., 2d, ██████████.
 Burke, Francis J., Jr., ██████████.
 Burke, Richard A., Jr., ██████████.
 Burke, Sib H., ██████████.
 Burke, William M., Jr., ██████████.
 Burt, John C., ██████████.
 Burton, Dawson L., ██████████.
 Burton, Donald L., ██████████.
 Bush, Emory W., ██████████.
 Bushyhead, Edward R., ██████████.
 Buswell, Arthur T., ██████████.
 Buttermore, Charles W., 3d, ██████████.
 Buxton, John L., ██████████.
 Byers, Robert D., ██████████.
 Bynam, Holland E., ██████████.
 Byrd, Doxey, Jr., ██████████.
 Caldwell, Richard G., ██████████.
 Calhoun, Charles C., ██████████.
 Calhoun, Creighton L., Jr., ██████████.
 Calvert, George H., ██████████.
 Camp, Dave E., ██████████.
 Campbell, Charles B., ██████████.
 Campbell, Donald A., ██████████.
 Campbell, Joseph R., ██████████.
 Campbell, Richard E., ██████████.
 Campbell, William R., ██████████.
 Campion, William W., ██████████.
 Cann, Donald C., ██████████.
 Cannefax, Robert W., ██████████.
 Carmody, Robert W., ██████████.
 Carrier, Billy C., ██████████.
 Carroll, William F., ██████████.
 Carruth, George A., ██████████.
 Carson, Martin B., ██████████.
 Carter, Harold M., ██████████.
 Carucci, Raymond A., ██████████.
 Caruso, Michael L., ██████████.

Casey, Franklin J., ██████████.
 Cass, Stanley D., ██████████.
 Castelli, Joseph G., ██████████.
 Castle, Edward R., Jr., ██████████.
 Cawley, John H., Jr., ██████████.
 Cei, Peter G., Jr., ██████████.
 Cento, Dahl J., ██████████.
 Chandler, Richard L., ██████████.
 Chaney, Arlen L., ██████████.
 Chaney, Bobby J., ██████████.
 Chapman, Paul P., ██████████.
 Charles, George H., Jr., ██████████.
 Chase, Edward L., ██████████.
 Chase, Gerald W., ██████████.
 Chenoweth, Robert T., ██████████.
 Chernault, James A., ██████████.
 Chesley, Arthur P., ██████████.
 Chittick, Peter J., ██████████.
 Christensen, Eric M., ██████████.
 Christenson, Willard M., ██████████.
 Christy, Bobby G., ██████████.
 Circeo, Louis J., Jr., ██████████.
 Clark, Davis, ██████████.
 Clark, Donald P., ██████████.
 Clark, Gary L., ██████████.
 Clark, Jon M., ██████████.
 Clark, Joseph E., ██████████.
 Clarke, Charles C., Jr., ██████████.
 Clarke, Edward F., ██████████.
 Clay, Clifford D., ██████████.
 Cleaver, George A., Jr., ██████████.
 Clelan, Joseph R., ██████████.
 Cline, Donald H., ██████████.
 Clites, James E., Jr., ██████████.
 Clove, John F., Jr., ██████████.
 Coates, Charles H., Jr., ██████████.
 Cochran, James O., ██████████.
 Cockrell, William F., Jr., ██████████.
 Codd, Nicholas J., Jr., ██████████.
 Coffee, Edwin F., Jr., ██████████.
 Coffman, Richard L., ██████████.
 Cofoni, Peter J., ██████████.
 Colket, Charles H., ██████████.
 Collier, William T., ██████████.
 Collings, J. Elmer, ██████████.
 Collins, David G., ██████████.
 Comeau, Robert F., ██████████.
 Conklin, Willard D., ██████████.
 Conley, James A., ██████████.
 Conrad, Hawkins M., ██████████.
 Conroy, Arthur T., Jr., ██████████.
 Conroy, Robert E., ██████████.
 Conway, James B., ██████████.
 Cook, James H., ██████████.
 Cook, John J., ██████████.
 Coon, Robert L., ██████████.
 Cooper, Albert C., ██████████.
 Cooper, Charles H., ██████████.
 Cooper, Jack B., ██████████.
 Cooper, Robert A., ██████████.
 Cooper, Robert T., ██████████.
 Cooper, Willis M., ██████████.
 Cordell, Ralph D., ██████████.
 Correll, Ralph T., ██████████.
 Cortez, James J., ██████████.
 Cothran, Paul E., ██████████.
 Cotter, Paul L., ██████████.
 Coughlin, James L., ██████████.
 Cover, John P., ██████████.
 Cowles, Phillip R., ██████████.
 Cox, Randall S., ██████████.
 Cox, Sammy T., ██████████.
 Craddock, Nicholas J., Jr., ██████████.
 Crater, John F., ██████████.
 Crawford, Jack F., ██████████.
 Crider, Terence A., ██████████.
 Crittenden, Robert N., ██████████.
 Crofford, Clifford D., ██████████.
 Croft, John A., ██████████.
 Cross, Freeman G., Jr., ██████████.
 Crows, Gilbert W., ██████████.
 Culbertson, Jerome B., ██████████.
 Cullins, Robert B., 3d, ██████████.
 Cummins, William, Jr., ██████████.
 Cunniff, Roy A., ██████████.
 Cunningham, Cleve, ██████████.
 Cunningham, James G., ██████████.
 Curran, Francis R., ██████████.
 Curran, Jan D., ██████████.
 Currier, Roger M., 4th, ██████████.
 Custer, Philip E., ██████████.
 Cutler, Edward J., ██████████.

Cyr, Charles W., Jr., ██████████.
 Dahl, John F., ██████████.
 Daluga, Richard B., ██████████.
 Damme, Richard J., ██████████.
 Daugherty, John M. Jr., ██████████.
 Davenport, Charles L., ██████████.
 Davenport, Theodore G., ██████████.
 Davies, Peter G., ██████████.
 Davies, William A., ██████████.
 Davis, Harold M., Jr., ██████████.
 Dawes, Robert C., ██████████.
 Dawson, Jon C., ██████████.
 Day, Herman E., Jr., ██████████.
 DeGraw, Allen C., ██████████.
 DeLany, Daniel J., ██████████.
 DeSimone, Frank P., Jr., ██████████.
 DeWitt, Calvin, 3d, ██████████.
 Dean, Richard C., ██████████.
 Dearden, Sheldon W., ██████████.
 Deel, Arlin, ██████████.
 DelVecchio, William P., ██████████.
 Delandro, Donald J., ██████████.
 Denmark, Sumner J., Jr., ██████████.
 Dennison, Gary V., ██████████.
 Deshler, Robert C., ██████████.
 Devereaux, Raymond A., ██████████.
 DiValentino, Leo E., ██████████.
 Dick, William W., 3d, ██████████.
 Dickson, Rodney, ██████████.
 Dillon, Gregory P., ██████████.
 Dilyard, Rex E., ██████████.
 Dion, George J., ██████████.
 Doar, James M., ██████████.
 Dodge, Rodney E., ██████████.
 Dodson, John P., ██████████.
 Doneski, Bernard J., 3d, ██████████.
 Donker, Leo M., ██████████.
 Dooling, Stephen V., ██████████.
 Doolittle, Lloyd W., ██████████.
 Dorough, Aaron G., ██████████.
 Dorward, Neil L., ██████████.
 Dougherty, James E., ██████████.
 Dougherty, Maurice F., ██████████.
 Dow, Richard A., ██████████.
 Dowds, James B., ██████████.
 Dross, Allen E., ██████████.
 Dross, David D., ██████████.
 Drudik, Robert L., ██████████.
 Druit, Clifford A., ██████████.
 Drummond, Louis A., ██████████.
 DuBois, Donald A., ██████████.
 Dubbelde, John B., ██████████.
 Dubose, Perryman F., ██████████.
 Dudzik, Joseph A., Jr., ██████████.
 Duhon, Ben E., ██████████.
 Duncan, Wayne M., ██████████.
 Duncan, William A., Jr., ██████████.
 Dunn, James E., ██████████.
 Dunn, James W., ██████████.
 Durbin, William B., ██████████.
 Durr, Donald D., ██████████.
 Dvorak, Philip J., ██████████.
 Dwayer, William M., ██████████.
 Dyer, Howard B., ██████████.
 Dyke, Charles W., ██████████.
 Dyson, Harold B., ██████████.
 East, Kenneth E., ██████████.
 Easterling, Ned H., Jr., ██████████.
 Easterwood, John L., Jr., ██████████.
 Easton, Donald G., ██████████.
 Eastwood, Clifford A., Jr., ██████████.
 Echevarria, William, ██████████.
 Edgar, James S. V., ██████████.
 Edwards, Emmet D., Jr., ██████████.
 Edwards, Richard L., ██████████.
 Elder, John F., 3d, ██████████.
 Ellis, Gary L., ██████████.
 Ellis, William R., ██████████.
 Ely, Sumner R., ██████████.
 Emery, Richard F., ██████████.
 Emrick, Charles W., ██████████.
 Engle, Phillip D., ██████████.
 English, Don C., ██████████.
 Ensign, Allyn B., ██████████.
 Eperson, Thomas A., ██████████.
 Erickson, Darrold J., ██████████.
 Erminger, Lee E., ██████████.
 Eure, Samuel L., ██████████.
 Evans, Walter C., ██████████.
 Everett, James W., ██████████.
 Ewanus, Milton D., ██████████.

Fadel, Richard A., XXXXXX.
 Fader, Jerome H., XXXXXX.
 Fairchild, Robert L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Fancher, Louis C., Jr., XXXXX.
 Faulkender, Robert W., XXXXX.
 Feaster, Lewis L., XXXXX.
 Feeney, Richard L., XXXXX.
 Fekete, Alexander J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Felber, Theodore D., XXXXX.
 Feld, Philip, XXXXX.
 Fennell, George R., Jr., XXXXX.
 Fenton, Donald F., XXXXX.
 Fentress, Harry B., XXXXX.
 Finch, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Finch, Kenneth W., XXXXX.
 Fingles, Douglas O., XXXXX.
 Finlay, John C., XXXXX.
 Fiorentino, William J., XXXXX.
 Fisher, Paul D., XXXXX.
 Fiske, John R., XXXXX.
 Fiske, William S., XXXXX.
 Flanagan, Carl P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Flanders, Norwood S., XXXXX.
 Fleming, Jerry L., XXXXX.
 Focer, Samuel W., Jr., XXXXX.
 Follansbee, John N., XXXXX.
 Fong, Joseph Y. K., XXXXX.
 Fontanella, David A., XXXXX.
 Ford, Wilbur E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Forgy, Jack O., XXXXX.
 Foster, Andrew R., Jr., XXXXX.
 Foster, Robert G., XXXXX.
 Furnier, Joseph J., XXXXX.
 Fox, Barry P., XXXXX.
 Fraker, John R., XXXXX.
 Franklin, Bobby G., XXXXX.
 Freeman, Carl F., XXXXX.
 Freitas, Louis H., XXXXX.
 Freyder, James G., XXXXX.
 Friedman, Fred L., XXXXX.
 Friend, William N., XXXXX.
 Frisbie, James G., XXXXX.
 Fritz, Richard L., XXXXX.
 Froebel, Martin C., XXXXX.
 Frost, Henry R., XXXXX.
 Fugitt, Billy W., XXXXX.
 Fulton, Lawrence P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Gagliardone, John L., XXXXX.
 Gaines, Merrel E., XXXXX.
 Gale, Edward W., XXXXX.
 Gallagher, Joseph P., XXXXX.
 Galloway, Gerald E., XXXXX.
 Gann, Charles E., XXXXX.
 Garigan, Thomas P., XXXXX.
 Garner, John J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Gaspard, Glaudis P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Gasper, John M., Jr., XXXXX.
 Gately, Michael P., XXXXX.
 Gates, Kermit H., Jr., XXXX.
 Gaustad, Peter J., XXXXX.
 Gaw, Stephen T., XXXXX.
 Gayler, Earl D., XXXXX.
 Gebhardt, William A., Jr., XXXXX.
 Geczy, George, Jr., XXXXX.
 Gentry, Paul E., XXXXX.
 Gentry, Roy C., XXXXX.
 George, Dannie E., XXXXX.
 George, Edward H., III, XXXXX.
 Giles, George E., XXXXX.
 Gilmore, Joseph R., XXXXX.
 Ginter, Duane L., XXXXX.
 Glasgow, William L., XXXXX.
 Glasker, Samuel J., XXXXX.
 Glen, George W. B., XXXXX.
 Glover, Richard R., XXXXX.
 Goetz, George W., XXXXX.
 Goetz, John A., XXXXX.
 Goldberg, William, XXXXX.
 Golden, William L., XXXXX.
 Gomon, Charles W., XXXXX.
 Gonzalez, Alvaro R., XXXXX.
 Goode, David E., XXXXX.
 Gooding, Ronald S., XXXXX.
 Goodson, Harry C., XXXXX.
 Gordon, Charles L., XXXXX.
 Gordon, Dudley J., XXXXX.
 Gordon, Walter C., XXXXX.
 Govatos, John N., XXXXX.
 Graham, Joseph E., XXXXX.
 Grant, Michael E., XXXXX.
 Gray, Frank M., Jr., XXXXX.

Gray, Joseph M., XXXXX.
 Green, James L., XXXXX.
 Green, Robert E., Jr., XXXX.
 Green, Thomas E., XXXXX.
 Greene, Earl M., XXXXX.
 Greenway, John R., XXXXX.
 Greenwood, Walter A., XXXX.
 Grim, Charles D., XXXXX.
 Grimes, Dan S., XXXXX.
 Griswold, Edward C., XXXXX.
 Grottkau, David L., XXXXX.
 Gross, Franklyn W., XXXXX.
 Gross, Woolf P., XXXXX.
 Groves, John E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Grubbs, William F., 2d, XXXXX.
 Gruber, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Gruhn, Thomas S., XXXXX.
 Guba, Howard J., XXXXX.
 Guillory, Larry G., XXXXX.
 Guldner, Francis J., XXXXX.
 Gullen, John P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hagyard, Warren A., XXXXX.
 Haldane, Douglas W., XXXXX.
 Hale, Charles A., XXXXX.
 Hall, Clarence E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hall, Francis W., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hall, George W., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hall, William E., XXXX.
 Hallinan, James M., Jr., XXXX.
 Hallmark, Billy J., XXXXX.
 Hallock, Donald V., XXXXX.
 Halloway, Kenneth E., Jr., XXXX.
 Halpern, Wayne J., XXXXX.
 Hammond, Leroy D., XXXXX.
 Hammond, Robert D., XXXXX.
 Hamner, Richard S., XXXXX.
 Hampton, Emery W., XXXXX.
 Hanawald, Len M., XXXXX.
 Hancock, James H., XXXXX.
 Handback, Henry C., XXXXX.
 Handley, Charles B., XXXXX.
 Hanigan, Francis L., XXXXX.
 Hanlin, Richard W., XXXXX.
 Hannen, William M., XXXXX.
 Hannon, Murray W., XXXXX.
 Harbuck, Eugene L., XXXXX.
 Hardegree, Bobby, L., OTYH.
 Hardy, Robert M., Jr., XXXXX.
 Harring, Anthony U., XXXXX.
 Harris, Bruce R., XXXXX.
 Harris, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Harris, Robert W., XXXXX.
 Harris, Thomas L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Harrison, Henry L., XXXXX.
 Harrison, William H., XXXXX.
 Hartmann, Frederick D., XXXXX.
 Harvard, Thomas P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Harwig, Donald H., XXXXX.
 Harwood, Michael S., XXXXX.
 Hatch, Henry J., XXXXX.
 Hatch, John F., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hatch, Vernon L., XXXXX.
 Hatcher, Robert T., XXXXX.
 Hawkins, Richard S., XXXXX.
 Hawley, Gerald S., XXXXX.
 Hays, Paul A., XXXXX.
 Hearne, William D., XXXXX.
 Hedcock, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Heggen, Larry E., XXXXX.
 Heidecker, Duane E., XXXXX.
 Henry, Ronald W., XXXXX.
 Henson, Hugh E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Herbert, Anthony B., XXXXX.
 Herbst, William R., XXXXX.
 Herring, Bernard M., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hertz, Sanford G., XXXXX.
 Hess, Carl E., XXXXX.
 Hettinger, John R., XXXXX.
 Heverly, Charles S., XXXXX.
 Hickerson, Arville L., XXXXX.
 Hickey, Edward L., XXXXX.
 Hicklin, Thomas R., XXXXX.
 Hickman, Jere L., XXXXX.
 Hicks, Frederick G., XXXXX.
 Hicks, Gerald F., Jr., XXXXX.
 Higgins, James M., XXXXX.
 Higgins, Michael S., XXXXX.
 High, Charles S., XXXXX.
 Higman, James H., XXXXX.
 Hildreth, Edward E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hill, James L. E., XXXXX.

Hill, John L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hill, Robert G., XXXXX.
 Hill, Theron H., XXXXX.
 Hilmo, Orin R., XXXXX.
 Hinds, William L., XXXXX.
 Hines, Joseph E., 3d, XXXXX.
 Hinspeter, William L., XXXXX.
 Hoagland, Merton B., XXXXX.
 Hobin, Raymond M., XXXXX.
 Hocker, John R., XXXXX.
 Hodges, Charles E., XXXXX.
 Hoff, Rodger L., XXXXX.
 Hoffman, Robert F., XXXXX.
 Hogan, Thomas J., XXXXX.
 Holladay, Van D., XXXXX.
 Hollenbeck, Elmer W., XXXXX.
 Holmes, David R., XXXXX.
 Holmes, James R., XXXXX.
 Holmes, Jasper F., XXXXX.
 Holmstrom, Ronald J., XXXXX.
 Holt, Bill V., XXXXX.
 Honsinger, Larry E., XXXXX.
 Hood, George E., XXXXX.
 Hopkins, James R., XXXXX.
 Horn, Robert C., XXXXX.
 Hornstein, Edmund H., XXXXX.
 Horton, Floyd W., XXXXX.
 Houllis, Harry S., XXXXX.
 House, Joseph W., XXXXX.
 Houser, George M., XXXXX.
 Houser, Houston P., 3d, XXXXX.
 Howard, James W., XXXXX.
 Howe, Robert H., XXXXX.
 Howerton, William B., XXXXX.
 Howes, Richard H., XXXXX.
 Hoyt, Richard E., XXXXX.
 Huddle, Charles E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Huff, Donald W., XXXXX.
 Hughes, Jimmie T., XXXXX.
 Hull, Michael H., XXXXX.
 Hummel, Richard H., XXXXX.
 Humphrey, Paul W., XXXXX.
 Humphrey, Raymond F., XXXXX.
 Humphreys, George D., XXXXX.
 Hunt, Byron W., XXXXX.
 Hunt, Gordon M., XXXXX.
 Hunt, Wallace G., XXXXX.
 Hunter, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Hylbert, Samuel L., XXXXX.
 Ilsemann, Michael J., XXXXX.
 Ingman, John F., XXXXX.
 Irwin, Carl H., Junior, XXXXX.
 Irwin, James T., XXXXX.
 Isbell, James C., XXXXX.
 Isham, James A., XXXXX.
 Israel, Glenn A., XXXXX.
 Iverson, George D., 5th, XXXXX.
 Izatt, James, XXXXX.
 Jackson, James W., XXXXX.
 Jacobs, Irwin M., XXXXX.
 Jacobs, Marvin, XXXXX.
 James, Jesse H., XXXXX.
 James, William N., XXXXX.
 Jameson, James J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Janert, Alfred C., Jr., XXXXX.
 Jenis, Donald S., XXXXX.
 Jenkins, James R., XXXXX.
 Jenks, George V., Jr., XXXXX.
 Jennings, Curtis A., XXXXX.
 Jeter, Munford S., XXXXX.
 Jewett, Richard E., XXXXX.
 Johanknecht, George P., XXXXX.
 Johns, Robert N., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Andrew C., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Arthur D., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Chester F., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Clifton R., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Donald K., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Ernest D., XXXXX.
 Johnson, James C., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Stanley T., XXXXX.
 Johnstone, Homer J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Joiner, Carey P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Jones, Gilbert E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Jones, Luther E., XXXXX.
 Jones, Ronald A., XXXXX.
 Jones, Walter R., XXXXX.
 Jordan, Howell H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Judson, Alan L., XXXXX.
 Judy, Jerry E., XXXXX.
 Kao, Peter K., XXXXX.

Kaiser, James B., XXXXX.
 Kaiser, Philip E., XXXXX.
 Karalekas, Charles J., XXXXX.
 Karr, Don E., XXXXX.
 Kastner, George D., XXXXX.
 Katz, Charles M., XXXXX.
 Kaufman, Raymond, Jr., XXXXX.
 Kawabata, Kazuto, XXXXX.
 Keefe, John L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Keefe, Victor F., XXXXX.
 Keel, Frank W., XXXXX.
 Kegelman, Theodore J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kehoe, Thomas P., XXXXX.
 Keith, Donald M., XXXXX.
 Kelley, James F., XXXXX.
 Kelley, John W., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kelly, Edward V., XXXXX.
 Kelly, Ted W., XXXXX.
 Kelly, Thomas A., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kelly, Thomas W., XXXXX.
 Keneipp, George E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kennedy, Irvin D., XXXXX.
 Kennett, Walter H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kensler, Jesse W., XXXXX.
 Kenyon, Richard D., XXXXX.
 Keogh, John J., XXXXX.
 Kerver, Thomas J., XXXXX.
 Kessinger, John M., XXXXX.
 Kester, William R., XXXXX.
 Ketchum, Raymond E. V., 2d, XXXXX.
 Keville, Clarence H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Keys, Robert W., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kielkopf, Edward C., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kilpe, Gunars, XXXXX.
 Kimura, Kay S., XXXXX.
 King, Charles M., XXXXX.
 King, Donald P., XXXXX.
 King, William T., XXXXX.
 King, William T., XXXXX.
 Kirk, John G., XXXXX.
 Kirk, Louis D., XXXXX.
 Kirkwood, John H., XXXXX.
 Kirshman, Norman H., XXXXX.
 Kite, John C., XXXXX.
 Kleypas, Kenneth A., XXXXX.
 Knakal, Joseph C., Jr., XXXXX.
 Knapper, Aubrey L., XXXXX.
 Kniemi, Matthew E., XXXXX.
 Knipp, James D., XXXXX.
 Koehnke, Joseph A., XXXXX.
 Kovel, Maxim I., XXXXX.
 Koford, Joel L., XXXXX.
 Kolb, Carter M., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kramer, Bryce R., XXXXX.
 Krapf, Albert H., 2d, XXXXX.
 Kreitzer, John C., XXXXX.
 Krome, Alan, XXXXX.
 Kubas, Michael J., XXXXX.
 Kunard, Donald D., XXXXX.
 Kuykendall, George B., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kysar, Alverado F., Jr., XXXXX.
 LaPorte, Justin G., XXXXX.
 Lackey, Lyman A., XXXXX.
 Ladd, John P., XXXXX.
 Lain, John C., XXXXX.
 Lakics, Robert J., XXXXX.
 Lane, Ralph B., XXXXX.
 Langer, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXX.
 Langworthy, Robert A., XXXXX.
 Lanham, Michael C., XXXXX.
 Laningham, William O., XXXXX.
 Lanzillo, Eugene R., XXXXX.
 Large, Darrell R., XXXXX.
 Larimer, Charles L., XXXXX.
 Laseau, Joseph N., XXXXX.
 Lattner, George J., XXXXX.
 Laughbon, Richard W., XXXXX.
 Lawson, Robert A., XXXXX.
 Lawton, Johnnie, Jr., XXXXX.
 Lea, Charles E., XXXXX.
 Leach, Robert A., XXXXX.
 Leard, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Leckinger, Paul A., XXXXX.
 Lecrone, Donald, XXXXX.
 Lee, James R., XXXXX.
 Lee, Walter T., XXXXX.
 Lee, William E., XXXXX.
 Leger, Jean C., XXXXX.
 Lehner, Scott J., XXXXX.
 Lehner, William J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Leitzky, John D., XXXXX.
 Lemes, Ralph V., XXXXX.
 Lenderman, William R., XXXXX.
 Lenoci, Joseph V., XXXXX.
 Lesko, Charles J., XXXXX.
 Lespasio, Neal A., XXXXX.
 Leuer, Kenneth C., XXXXX.
 Lewers, Sam, XXXXX.
 Lewis, John C., XXXXX.
 Lewis, Robert C., XXXXX.
 Ley, Donald R., XXXXX.
 Liakos, William G., XXXXX.
 Ligon, Claude M., XXXXX.
 Ligon, Robert E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Liles, Michael S., XXXXX.
 Lindholm, Tom L., XXXXX.
 Lindsey, Jerry N., XXXXX.
 Lingaitis, Francis V., XXXXX.
 Link, Elbert W., XXXXX.
 Lippe, Lawrence, XXXXX.
 Little, John A., XXXXX.
 Little, Ronald E., XXXXX.
 Littlejohn, Thomas W., XXXXX.
 Loberg, John C., XXXXX.
 Lockaby, Jesse S., Jr., XXXXX.
 Lockwood, Willard E., XXXXX.
 Loeffke, Bernardo, XXXXX.
 Lofton, Marvin, XXXXX.
 Logan, Laddie B., XXXXX.
 Logan, Rodney W., XXXXX.
 Lollis, James A., XXXXX.
 Lomax, Rhoss C., Jr., XXXXX.
 London, William G., XXXXX.
 Long, John E., XXXXX.
 Long, Kenneth D., XXXXX.
 Loomis, Robert W., XXXXX.
 Loop, James W., XXXXX.
 Lopes, Francis J., XXXXX.
 Lorms, John L., XXXXX.
 Losik, Robert C., XXXXX.
 Lott, Kirby J., XXXXX.
 Loudermilk, Roy L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Love, Harold M., XXXXX.
 Lucas, Dale A., XXXXX.
 Lucas, Ronald M., XXXXX.
 Luck, Bennie E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Luke, Dawson B., XXXXX.
 Luke, John B., XXXXX.
 Luna, Raymundo R., XXXXX.
 Lusk, James A., XXXXX.
 Lustig, Jacob E., XXXXX.
 Luther, Ralph A., XXXXX.
 Luther, William H., XXXXX.
 Lyle, John A., XXXXX.
 Lyons, Calvin G., XXXXX.
 MacGill, James F., XXXXX.
 MacHatton, Joseph G., XXXXX.
 MacKusick, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Machen, Bobby, XXXXX.
 Madson, Arlyn R., XXXXX.
 Maffett, Fletcher H., XXXXX.
 Maguire, James E., XXXXX.
 Malone, K. H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Maloney, James E., 3d, XXXXX.
 Manahan, Richard R., XXXXX.
 Mangum, Robin, XXXXX.
 Manner, Eugene L., XXXXX.
 Manning, Albert E., XXXXX.
 Mapes, John B., Jr., XXXXX.
 Marmaras, Ernest, XXXXX.
 Marmor, John W., XXXXX.
 Marrella, Leonard S., XXXXX.
 Marsh, Elgin R., Jr., XXXXX.
 Marsh, Robert, XXXXX.
 Martin, Alfred L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Martin, Ernest H., XXXXX.
 Martin, Mason E., XXXXX.
 Martin, Yancey F., XXXXX.
 Martinez, Howard M., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mascia, Donald J., XXXXX.
 Mason, Arthur W., XXXXX.
 Mason, John, XXXXX.
 Massey, Oran A., XXXXX.
 Mastro, Franklin D., XXXXX.
 Matheson, Edgar M., XXXXX.
 Mathis, Milton H., XXXXX.
 Matsu, Herbert T., XXXXX.
 Matthews, Church M., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mattison, Charles H., XXXXX.
 May, Elmer C., XXXXX.
 May, Francis B., XXXXX.
 May, Richard L., XXXXX.
 McAfee, Floyd H., XXXXX.
 McBride, Eugene R., XXXXX.
 McBride, Morris R., XXXXX.
 McCall, Gerald T., XXXXX.
 McCarthy, Edward W., Jr., XXXXX.
 McCarthy, Fox, XXXXX.
 McCarthy, John M., XXXXX.
 McClain, Charles S., XXXXX.
 McClain, Terrence W., XXXXX.
 McCleave, Robert E., XXXXX.
 McConkey, Rodney F., XXXXX.
 McConnell, Bruce D., XXXXX.
 McConnell, Rodney D., XXXXX.
 McCoy, George V., XXXXX.
 McCrary, Thomas D., XXXXX.
 McCullom, Cornell, Jr., XXXXX.
 McDonald, John M., XXXXX.
 McDonald, Thomas B., 3d, XXXXX.
 McDonough, Bruce B., XXXXX.
 McDowell, Richard L., XXXXX.
 McGivern, Parlan L., XXXXX.
 McGovern, George W., Jr., XXXXX.
 McGowan, Paul A., XXXXX.
 McGowan, Richard M., XXXXX.
 McHugh, Thomas P., XXXXX.
 McKay, Michael J., XXXXX.
 McKie, Robert H., Jr., XXXXX.
 McKinley, Martin E., XXXXX.
 McKinney, Horatio W., XXXXX.
 McKinstry, Thomas I., XXXXX.
 McLaughlin, James J., XXXXX.
 McLaughlin, John O., XXXXX.
 McNulty, William B., XXXXX.
 McWhirter, Julian H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mead, Dana G., XXXXX.
 Mead, Warne D., XXXXX.
 Meaney, Edward J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Medford, Dillard E., XXXXX.
 Meehan, John J. P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Menefee, William P., XXXXX.
 Meredith, James M., XXXXX.
 Merrick, Robert L., XXXXX.
 Merritt, Hubert D., XXXXX.
 Metallos, James Z., XXXXX.
 Mettam, Richard E., XXXXX.
 Meyer, Conan G., XXXXX.
 Michel, Thomas E., XXXXX.
 Mielke, Karl A., Jr., XXXXX.
 Miklinski, Anthony R., XXXXX.
 Mikuta, Joel J., XXXXX.
 Miller, Edward H., XXXXX.
 Miles, Ralph E., XXXXX.
 Miller, Austin E., XXXXX.
 Miller, Donald L., XXXXX.
 Miller, Robert F., XXXXX.
 Miller, Roger E., XXXXX.
 Miller, Royce D., XXXXX.
 Miller, Spencer R., XXXXX.
 Milliron, Joseph F., XXXXX.
 Mills, Charles S., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mills, Lawrence L., XXXXX.
 Mills, Robert R., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mitchell, John H., XXXXX.
 Mitchell, John S., XXXXX.
 Mittelstaedt, Robert N., XXXXX.
 Mixter, Wilbur R., XXXXX.
 Modica, Giac P., XXXXX.
 Molinelli, Robert F., XXXXX.
 Monaco, Nicholas, Jr., XXXXX.
 Monahan, Edward J., XXXXX.
 Montalvo, Martin T., XXXXX.
 Montgomery, James D., Jr., XXXXX.
 Montgomery, Ross D., XXXXX.
 Moore, Marshall L., XXXXX.
 Moore, Robert D., XXXXX.
 Moran, Hugh F., Jr., XXXXX.
 Morey, William S., XXXXX.
 Morgan, Jack E., XXXXX.
 Morrison, Kenneth L., XXXXX.
 Morrow, Cecil R., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mortensen, Theodore J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Morton, Richard H., XXXXX.
 Mosco, Richard A., XXXXX.
 Moser, William R., XXXXX.
 Moses, Charles C., XXXXX.
 Moses, Laurence G., XXXXX.
 Moxley, Thomas T., XXXXX.
 Mudd, William C., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mudgett, John S., XXXXX.
 Muenter, William T., XXXXX.
 Mullen, David A., XXXXX.

Mullins, Donald G., XXXXXX.
 Mungovan, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Murchison, John T., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Murphy, Clifton M., XXXXXX.
 Murphy, John A., XXXXXX.
 Murphy, John E., XXXXXX.
 Murphy, William E., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Murray, Jackson S., XXXXXX.
 Musial, Walter F., XXXXXX.
 Myers, John T., XXXXXX.
 Nack, John M., XXXXXX.
 Nader, Walter E., XXXXXX.
 Nagel, Joseph L., XXXXXX.
 Nash, Harold F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Nash, John N., XXXXXX.
 Nash, Tom P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Naumann, Ralph E., XXXXXX.
 Negaard, Carman D., XXXXXX.
 Nelson, Clifford R., XXXXXX.
 Nelson, Maynard L., XXXXXX.
 Nelson, Theodore R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Nelson, William J., XXXXXX.
 Nemeth, Philip K., XXXXXX.
 Neukamm, Bruno J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Newlin, Edgar C., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Newman, Erman M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Newman, Joe B., XXXXXX.
 Newman, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Newsom, Samuel J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Newton, George F., XXXXXX.
 Nicholas, Talbot J., XXXXXX.
 Nicks, John G., XXXXXX.
 Nicoll, Wayne B., XXXXXX.
 Niemczyk, Theodore T., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Niles, Gary W., XXXXXX.
 Noakes, Edmund D., XXXXXX.
 Nobriga, Gordon H., XXXXXX.
 Nock, Carleton C., XXXXXX.
 Nock, Jean A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Norris, James B., XXXXXX.
 Nottingham, Jonathan D., XXXXXX.
 Oakes, Leslie C., XXXXXX.
 Oaks, Clarence B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 O'Brien, Robert A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 O'Connor, John H., XXXXXX.
 Offan, Kenneth J., XXXXXX.
 Ogden, Leigh M., XXXXXX.
 O'Grady, George L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Okita, Harold K., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Olsmith, Edwin S., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Olson, Hardin L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Olson, Martin G., XXXXXX.
 Olson, Thomas E., XXXXXX.
 Onellion, Willard M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Oneto, John B., XXXXXX.
 O'Rourke, Lewis C., XXXXXX.
 Otto, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Owen, Thomas D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Owens, Sherrill, XXXXXX.
 Paas, Alfred O., XXXXXX.
 Pack, Kenneth L., XXXXXX.
 Padgett, Lary W., XXXXXX.
 Padilla, Ramon, XXXXXX.
 Pagel, John A., XXXXXX.
 Palmer, Arthur N., XXXXXX.
 Palmer, William T., XXXXXX.
 Palmertree, Tommy R., XXXXXX.
 Palmieri, Guy J., XXXXXX.
 Paradiso, Richard A., XXXXXX.
 Pare, Harold J., XXXXXX.
 Parham, Byron A. P., XXXXXX.
 Parke, Walter M., XXXXXX.
 Parker, Murry E., XXXXXX.
 Parker, Richard G., XXXXXX.
 Parks, Donald, XXXXXX.
 Parr, Ivan W., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Parrack, Jim M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Passmaneck, David J., XXXXXX.
 Pastore, Richard M., XXXXXX.
 Pataro, Rudolph N., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Patrick, Burton D., XXXXXX.
 Patte, Chris, XXXXXX.
 Patterson, Jerry K., XXXXXX.
 Patterson, John T., XXXXXX.
 Patterson, Raydean H., XXXXXX.
 Patterson, Willard L., XXXXXX.
 Peach, James G., XXXXXX.
 Pearlman, James T., XXXXXX.
 Pearson, Theodore J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Peckham, John H., XXXXXX.
 Peden, Ronald L., XXXXXX.

Penrose, Newton B., XXXXXX.
 Penzler, Harry D., XXXXXX.
 Ferrine, David P., XXXXXX.
 Perry, James R., XXXXXX.
 Perry, Mervin E., XXXXXX.
 Person, John L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Peterson, Harlan F., XXXXXX.
 Peterson, Walter R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Pettersen, Clifford D., XXXXXX.
 Pfeil, Henry, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Philipp, Ronald E., XXXXXX.
 Philpott, Lawrence D., XXXXXX.
 Phipps, Donald E., XXXXXX.
 Planka, Thomas A., XXXXXX.
 Pickens, Homer C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Pierce, Isaiah B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Piner, James, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Pinkston, William R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Pipes, Jack R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Pipkin, John R., XXXXXX.
 Place, Berwyn L., XXXXXX.
 Pocock, James A., XXXXXX.
 Polczynski, Albert R., XXXXXX.
 Pope, Donald R., XXXXXX.
 Porter, Bobby B., XXXXXX.
 Porter, Royce L., XXXXXX.
 Porter, Thomas A., XXXXXX.
 Portier, Gerald C., XXXXXX.
 Potamos, Christ F., XXXXXX.
 Powe, Carl M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Powell, James D., XXXXXX.
 Powell, Raymond G., XXXXXX.
 Powell, Richard E., XXXXXX.
 Powell, Walter W., 2d, XXXXXX.
 Powell, William S., XXXXXX.
 Powers, Max L., XXXXXX.
 Press, Donald E., XXXXXX.
 Prewitt, Herbert F., XXXXXX.
 Price, George W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Price, Roger J., XXXXXX.
 Price, Roy C., XXXXXX.
 Pritchard, Donald H., XXXXXX.
 Pritchard, Walter L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Proctor, Marvin P., XXXXXX.
 Prossor, John E., XXXXXX.
 Proulx, Clovis B., XXXXXX.
 Provine, Carl R., XXXXXX.
 Puett, Joseph F., XXXX.
 Pugh, John W., XXXXXX.
 Pullin, James R., XXXXXX.
 Puttkammer, Paul D., XXXXXX.
 Quatannens, Louis S., XXXXXX.
 Quintard, Jerry L., XXXXXX.
 Radclif, William A., XXXXXX.
 Radler, Charles M., XXXXXX.
 Rafferty, James E., XXXXXX.
 Rahn, William E., XXXXXX.
 Raines, Fred B., XXXXXX.
 Rakowitz, James A., XXXXXX.
 Ramsden, John J., XXXXXX.
 Ramsey, Russell W., XXXXXX.
 Randolph, William M., XXXXXX.
 Rawls, Paul L., XXXXXX.
 Rawls, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Ray, James W., XXXXXX.
 Ray, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Raymond, Charles L., XXXXXX.
 Raynes, Troyce L., XXXXXX.
 Reagan, Jerry E., XXXXXX.
 Reedy, Henry J., XXXXXX.
 Reel, Ralph E., XXXXXX.
 Reeves, Donald W., XXXXXX.
 Reget, Gene R., XXXXXX.
 Reichel, James E., XXXXXX.
 Reichelt, Eric F., XXXXXX.
 Reid, Wilbur E., XXXXXX.
 Reidy, William D., XXXXXX.
 Remington, Allen K., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Reue, David N., XXXXXX.
 Reynolds, George F., XXXXXX.
 Reynolds, Robert M., XXXXXX.
 Rhichard, Clinton P., XXXXXX.
 Rhoades, Glen L., XXXXXX.
 Rhodes, Howard E., XXXXXX.
 Rich, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Richardson, George L., XXXXXX.
 Richardson, James O., XXXXXX.
 Riedl, William H., XXXXXX.
 Riley, John G., XXXXXX.
 Ring, Taft C., XXXXXX.
 Rink, James H., XXXXXX.

Rivo, Jose A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Ritchey, John P., XXXXXX.
 Riviere, Francis, XXXX.
 Robbins, Grant C., XXXXXX.
 Roberts, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Roberts, Donald A., XXXXXX.
 Roberts, Donald M., XXXXXX.
 Roberts, Norman L., XXXXXX.
 Roberts, Roy A., XXXXXX.
 Robinson, Bobby C., XXXXXX.
 Robinson, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Robinson, James B., XXXXXX.
 Robinson, Nicholas J., XXXXXX.
 Robinson, Thonius, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Rock, Thomas L., XXXXXX.
 Roddy, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Rodenmayer, John P., XXXXXX.
 Rodgers, Robert J., XXXXXX.
 Rodriguez, Cesar A., XXXXXX.
 Roebuck, Thomas W., XXXXXX.
 Rogers, George V., XXXXXX.
 Rogers, Gordon B., Jr., XXXX.
 Rogers, William H., XXXXXX.
 Rogers, William R., XXXXXX.
 Roller, Robin J., XXXX.
 Roman, Theodore, XXXXXX.
 Rose, Barnes W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Rose, Buel T., XXXXXX.
 Roth, Morton F., XXXXXX.
 Roth, Thomas J., XXXXXX.
 Rowinski, Thomas H., XXXXXX.
 Rowlands, David L., XXXXXX.
 Rubin, David B., XXXXXX.
 Rudrow, Robert G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Runyan, Thomas E., XXXX.
 Rupp, James E., XXXXXX.
 Ruppe, Jake M., XXXXXX.
 Russell, Beryl D., XXXXXX.
 Russell, George G., XXXXXX.
 Russo, Joseph S., XXXXXX.
 Rutter, Leo F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Ryan, James T., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Sadler, Clyde D., XXXXXX.
 Salmonson, Peter C., XXXXXX.
 Salzman, James D., XXXXXX.
 Sanchez, Manuel L., XXXXXX.
 Sanchez, James, XXXXXX.
 Sanders, Reuben L., XXXXXX.
 Sanford, Thomas H., XXXXXX.
 Santa Barbara, Joseph R., XXXXXX.
 Santilli, Joseph F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Sapp, Clarence D., XXXXXX.
 Saunders, Don M., XXXXXX.
 Saunders, Donald S., XXXXXX.
 Schaefer, John E., XXXXXX.
 Scheff, Richard P., XXXXXX.
 Schessler, Donald R., XXXXXX.
 Schiefer, Henry J., XXXXXX.
 Schiesser, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Schmidt, Guy L., XXXXXX.
 Schnable, Elmer J., XXXXXX.
 Schneman, Douglas, XXXXXX.
 Schober, Frank J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Schofield, David G., XXXXXX.
 Scholtes, Richard A., XXXXXX.
 Schorr, David E., XXXXXX.
 Schroeder, Eldon K., XXXXXX.
 Schubert, John E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Schuler, James D., XXXXXX.
 Schulze, Howard D., XXXXXX.
 Schumacher, Henry J., XXXXXX.
 Schwoppe, Edwin G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Scott, Jerry C., XXXXXX.
 Scott, John R., XXXXXX.
 Scudder, Charles P., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Sedgwick, Clyde N., XXXXXX.
 Seely, William B., XXXXXX.
 Seitz, Donald E., XXXXXX.
 Serna, Albert I., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Serpico, Frank L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Serrin, Phillip A., 2d, XXXXXX.
 Sexton, Herman L., XXXXXX.
 Seybold, Lawrence C., XXXXXX.
 Shaddock, Carroll W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Shannon, Douglas, XXXXXX.
 Sharp, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Shaw, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Shellabarger, Harold L., XXXXXX.
 Shimek, E. Joe, 2d, XXXXXX.
 Shoptaugh, Leland D., XXXXXX.
 Shuman, John N., XXXXXX.

Shumway, James D., XXXXX
 Siegel, James L., XXXXX
 Siles, Sigvert R., XXXXX
 Simila, Kenneth R., XXXXX
 Simmons, Cecil K., XXXXX
 Simons, Robert J., XXXXX
 Simons, Simon I., XXXXX
 Simpson, Robert B., XXXXX
 Simpson, William, XXXXX
 Sims, Charles O., 3d, XXXXX
 Sims, John C., Jr., XXXXX
 Sims, Wesley N., XXXXX
 Sindoni, Samuel S., XXXXX
 Skahan, Michael N., XXXXX
 Skelton, Robert C., XXXXX
 Skinner, Gary N., Sr., XXXXX
 Sloan, Charles W., XXXXX
 Smith, Albert J., XXXXX
 Smith, David L., XXXXX
 Smith, Derald H., XXXXX
 Smith, Donald R., XXXXX
 Smith, George O., XXXXX
 Smith, James D., XXXXX
 Smith, Jimmy W., XXXXX
 Smith, John D., XXXXX
 Smith, Raymond G., XXXXX
 Smith, Samuel E., XXXXX
 Smith, Walter D., XXXXX
 Smith, William L., XXXXX
 Smolenyak, George C., XXXXX
 Snyder, Harold B., Jr., XXXXX
 Snyder, James E., XXXXX
 Snyder, Ronald E., XXXXX
 Sobraske, John E., XXXXX
 Solberg, Anthony M., XXXXX
 Solley, Charles W., XXXXX
 Solomon, Jack M., XXXXX
 Somerville, Paul F., XXXXX
 Sones, Vernon B., XXXXX
 Sowers, William R., Jr., XXXX 3.
 Soyster, Harry E., XXXXX
 Spears, Joseph M., Jr., XXXXX
 Spector, Joseph H., XXXXX
 Spence, Ray L., XXXXX
 Speth, Gerald L., XXXXX
 Spodobalski, Anthony C., XXXXX
 Sprague, Charles R., XXXXX
 Sprague, James D., XXXXX
 Spurgers, Roy K., XXXXX
 Squires, Myron E., XXXXX
 Staggs, Leon D., XXXXX
 Stamps, John R., XXXXX
 Stasky, Gail V., XXXXX
 Stearns, Peter D., XXXXX
 Steed, Dale C., XXXXX
 Steel, Richard E., XXXXX
 Steffen, Albert J., XXXXX
 Steffen, William E., XXXXX
 Steger, George F., XXXXX
 Steimle, Carl R., XXXXX
 Stein, Edward J., Jr., XXXXX
 Stein, Michael K., XXXXX
 Stemley, Gary A., XXXXX
 Stephenson, Richard E., XXXX
 Stern, Allan R., XXXXX
 Stevens, Francis R., Jr., XXXXX
 Stevens, Ronald B., XXXXX
 Stewart, John P., XXXXX
 Stewart, Kelly E., XXXXX
 Stewart, Robert C., XXXXX
 Stewart, Ronald B., XXXXX
 Stewart, William R., XXXXX
 Stinson, Kenneth B., XXXX
 Stipe, Aquila E., XXXXX
 Stipe, John W. M., Jr., XXXX
 Stockhammer, Gordon F., XXXXX
 Stockhausen, William T., XXXXX
 Stoddard, Timothy D., XXXXX
 Stokes, John H., 3d, XXXXX
 Stone, Charles B., 4th, XXXXX
 Stone, Gordon L., XXXXX
 Storms, Robert N. Jr., XXXXX
 Stotser, George R., XXXXX
 Stout, Bruce F., XXXXX
 Stout, Thomas E., XXXXX
 Stuart, James R., XXXXX
 Stykos, John S., XXXX
 Summers, Wallen M., XXXXX
 Swann, Roscoe A., Jr., XXXXX
 Swayne, Charles J., XXXXX
 Swenson, James A., XXXXX
 Swindler, Murray G., XXXXX
 Szendrey, Charles P., XXXXX
 Szvetecz, Edward, XXXXX
 Takenaka, Harold H., XXXXX
 Talbot, George T., Jr., XXXXX
 Tamminen, David L., XXXXX
 Taylor, Billy H., XXXXX
 Taylor, Harry S., XXXXX
 Taylor, Henry S., 3d, XXXXX
 Taylor, James V., XXXXX
 Teale, Willis E., Jr., XXXXX
 Teasley, Harry N., Jr., XXXXX
 Tedeschi, Joseph R., XXXXX
 Tener, Robert K., XXXXX
 Tengan, James T., XXXXX
 Tengler, John A., XXXXX
 Terrana, Vincent, XXXXX
 Terry, Clifford F., XXXXX
 Tettelbach, Donald C., XXXXX
 Theroux, Gilbert L., XXXXX
 Thomas, Harry L., XXXXX
 Thomas, Robert W., XXXXX
 Thompson, Chadwick C., XXXXX
 Thompson, Ross E. G., Jr., XXXXX
 Thompson, Thomas G., XXXXX
 Thompson, William R., XXXXX
 Thomson, Robert W., XXXXX
 Tieken, Richard V., XXXXX
 Tilly, Clyde C., Jr., XXXXX
 Tilton, Robert C., XXXXX
 Timlin, Jerome P., XXXXX
 Timmons, Robert W., XXXXX
 Tindall, Asa W., Jr., XXXXX
 Todd, Carmen D., XXXXX
 Tomaka, Karl S., XXXXX
 Tooloo, Jay C., XXXXX
 Toolson, John M., Jr., XXXXX
 Torf, Arthur S., XXXXX
 Townsend, Merton L., XXXXX
 Townsend, Robert F., XXXXX
 Traficante, Anthony J., XXXXX
 Trdla, Joseph R., XXXXX
 Treat, Robert B., Jr., XXXXX
 Treece, Ausby J., XXXXX
 Tribe, Donald S., XXXXX
 Tucker, Andrew L., XXXXX
 Tucker, James M., XXXXX
 Tucker, Lee W., XXXXX
 Tullington, Bernard J., Jr., XXXXX
 Turk, Roy M., XXXXX
 Turnbull, Robert B., XXXXX
 Turner, Donald E., XXXXX
 Turner, Thomas E., 3d, XXXXX
 Tussing, James T., XXXXX
 Tweddell, Johnny B., XXXXX
 Undercoffer, John T., XXXXX
 Vail, Robert B., XXXXX
 Valle, John D., XXXXX
 Van Buskirk, Kenneth C., Jr., XXXXX
 Van Cleave, Henry D., Jr., XXXXX
 Van Herpe, William H., XXXXX
 Van Houten, Peter F., XXXXX
 Van Winkle, Daniel G., XXXXX
 Vandergrift, Kennard S., Jr., XXXXX
 Vardamis, Alexander A., Jr., XXXXX
 Vargo, John J., Jr., XXXXX
 Varner, Veloy J., XXXXX
 Vaughn, Norman M., Jr., XXXXX
 Ventzek, Robert E., XXXXX
 Vermillion, Robert V., XXXXX
 Vickers, John H., XXXXX
 Vicknair, Darrell H., XXXXX
 Vockery, William L., XXXXX
 Voorhees, Theodore B., XXXXX
 Vossen, Francis C., XXXXX
 Vuono, Carl E., XXXXX
 Wade, Merle L., XXXXX
 Wadhams, Bruce M., XXXXX
 Wagner, Stanley G., XXXXX
 Waite, Richard D., XXXXX
 Wakefield, Donald Y., XXXXX
 Walker, Harry D., XXXXX
 Walker, Jack E., XXXXX
 Walker, Orien J., Jr., XXXXX
 Walker, Peter H., XXXXX
 Walker, Prosper N., XXXXX
 Walker, Robert E., Jr., XXXXX
 Wall, Walter F., XXXXX
 Walters, Charles O., XXXXX
 Ward, Jerry E., XXXXX
 Ward, William A., XXXXX
 Waring, Mowton Le C., Jr., XXXXX
 Waters, John L., XXXXX
 Watke, Frederic W., XXXXX
 Watkins, Edward A., Jr., XXXXX
 Watson, Gerald G., XXXXX
 Watson, James H., XXXXX
 Wattelet, Ronald R., XXXX
 Watts, Ronald L., XXXXX
 Weber, Andrew M., Jr., XXXXX
 Webster, Howard E., Jr., XXXXX
 Weeks, Jimmy D., XXXXX
 Weeks, Leon R., XXXXX
 Weeks, Richard G., XXXXX
 Weinert, Phillip D., XXXXX
 Welch, Charles W., XXXXX
 Welch, Larry L., XXXX
 Wells, David K., XXXXX
 Wells, Donald G., XXXXX
 West, Louis, XXXXX
 Westerfeldt, Robert C., XXXXX
 Westhoff, William J., XXXXX
 Weston, Ray D., XXXXX
 Wetherington, Bernard J., XXXX
 Whalen, Donald P., XXXXX
 Wharton, Walter N., XXXXX
 Whatley, Howard G., XXXXX
 Whiddon, Orren R., XXXXX
 White, Billy T., XXXXX
 White, Jewel G., XXXXX
 White, Stanley Z., XXXXX
 Whitmire, James D., XXXXX
 Whitt, Lawrence H., XXXXX
 Whittle, William E., XXXXX
 Wiersema, Kenneth E., XXXXX
 Wilder, Allen S., Jr., XXXXX
 Wiley, Chester J., XXXXX
 Wilhème, Edmund A., XXXXX
 Wilkinson, John C., XXXXX
 Willett, Frank W., XXXXX
 Willey, John L., XXXXX
 Williams, Charles L., 3d, XXXXX
 Williams, Donald E., Jr., XXXXX
 Williams, Edward H., XXXXX
 Williams, Graybill E., XXXXX
 Williams, Jerry A., XXXXX
 Williams, Jerry R., XXXX
 Williams, Richard R., Jr., XXXXX
 Williams, Ross S., XXXXX
 Williams, William J., Jr., XXXXX
 Williams, William S., XXXXX
 Williamson, James C., XXXXX
 Willies, Edward J., XXXX
 Wilson, Albert H., 3d, XXXXX
 Wilson, Daniel M., XXXXX
 Wilson, Gordon E., XXXXX
 Wilson, Nicholas B., XXXXX
 Windsor, James A., XXXX
 Winkler, Carl G., XXXXX
 Winne, Ross W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Winters, Donald L., XXXXX
 Winters, Robert E., XXXXX
 Wise, Harry L., Jr., XXXXX
 Wise, Joseph R., XXXXX
 Wiser, Robert M., XXXXX
 Wishart, Leonard P., 3d, XXXXX
 Witbrodt, Donald J., XXXXX
 Witt, Everett L., XXXXX
 Witt, Jerry V., XXXXX
 Wittman, Clarence E., XXXXX
 Wold, Pedar C., XXXXX
 Wolfe, Robert A., XXXXX
 Wolfe, William D., XXXXX
 Wolfe, William M., XXXXX
 Wood, Billy B., XXXXX
 Wood, Peter W., XXXXX
 Woods, Robert D., XXXXX
 Woods, Robert P., XXXXX
 Woods, Roger B., XXXXX
 Woolnough, James P., XXXXX
 Wray, Donald E., XXXXX
 Wright, Stuart E., XXXXX
 Wright, William K., XXXXX
 Yates, William E., XXXXX
 Yearly, Ira W., XXXXX
 Yoos, Robert E., XXXXX
 Young, Charles D., XXXXX
 Young, Lawrence B. H., Jr., XXXXX
 Yuhn, John T., XXXXX
 Yuill, Stuart J., XXXXX
 Zabriskie, Cedric J., XXXXX
 Zachgo, Durl D., XXXXX

Zarch, Alan R., XXXXX.
 Zickel, Raymond E., XXXXX.
 Zirkle, Michael N., XXXXX.
 Zitz, Joseph S., XXXXX.
 Zoeller, Robert J., XXXXX.
 Zychowski, Edward F., XXXXX.

To be captain, chaplain

Beaver, Reinard W., XXXXX.
 Clark, Donald D., XXXXX.
 Day, Roland F., XXXXX.
 Hilton, Gerald K., XXXXX.
 Howerton, Robert B., XXXXX.
 Jett, Mace T., Jr., XXXXX.
 Kieschnick, Alton R., XXXXX.
 Lindenauer, Jon M., XXXXX.
 Matthias, Charles B., XXXXX.
 Moore, Willard F., XXXXX.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Caldwell, Doris L., XXXX.
 Clifford, Margaret, XXXX.
 Cooper, Alice E., XXXX.
 Hallman, Jane I., XXXX.
 Herms, Frances K., XXXX.
 Hess, Anna M., XXXX.
 Homeyer, Anne W., XXXX.
 Mastropool, Gladys N., XXXX.
 Raines, Ruth D., XXXX.
 Shelton, Ellen J., XXXX.
 Sylvester, Suzanne E., XXXX.

To be captain, Medical Corps

Agee, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Allen, Bohn D., XXXXX.
 Allen, Harold J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Annable, Charles R., XXXXX.
 Arthur, James D., XXXXX.
 Bean, Stuart K., XXXXX.
 Becker, Arthur A., XXXXX.
 Bolick, Larry E., XXXXX.
 Bourgeois, Curtis H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Brainard, William C., XXXXX.
 Brougher, Robert H., XXXXX.
 Browning, Donald G., XXXXX.
 Burton, Thomas H., XXXXX.
 Cason, William P., XXXXX.
 Cocke, Joseph G., Jr., XXXXX.
 Cohen, Richard J., XXXXX.
 Cooper, Edgar L., XXXXX.
 Cornell, Paul J., XXXXX.
 Dickerson, Alfred G., XXXXX.
 Edmonds, Paul B., XXXXX.
 Ellison, Norig, XXXXX.
 Evans, Richard, 3d, XXXXX.
 Feilger, Charles E., XXXXX.
 Fuqua, William B., XXXXX.
 Gates, Francis K., Jr., XXXXX.
 Gerhard, Clyde, XXXXX.
 Gulton, Carl R., XXXXX.
 Hano, Jessie E., XXXXX.
 Harris, Charles H., XXXXX.
 Haymond, David R., XXXXX.
 Helmus, Wilbert F., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hemingway, Dennis L., XXXXX.
 Heymann, Robert L., XXXXX.
 Hughes, Robert P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hutchison, William A., XXXXX.
 Jensen, Walter L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Jones, Charles B., Jr., XXXXX.
 Ladner, Calvin N., XXXXX.
 Lawrence, Donald J., XXXXX.
 Leary, John B., XXXXX.
 Lett, Charles R., XXXXX.
 Levy, Morris S., XXXXX.
 Madison, David S., XXXXX.
 Magoline, Alfred J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Martin, Jerry R., XXXXX.
 McLean, Robert B., XXXXX.
 Miller, Donald F., XXXXX.
 Monzingo, George F., XXXXX.
 O'Rourke, George W., XXXXX.
 Painter, Milford R., Jr., XXXXX.
 Perito, John E., XXXXX.
 Pittkethly, David T., XXXXX.
 Quarantilo, Edward P., Jr., XXXXX.
 Rainville, Thomas J., XXXXX.
 Sauer, Gerald F., XXXXX.
 Sheaffer, Harold C., XXXXX.
 Shown, Thomas E., XXXXX.
 Soha, Albert J., XXXXX.
 Sprengelmeyer, James T., XXXXX.

Strickland, Alva L., XXXXX.
 Terrell, Dudley J., XXXXX.
 Thuss, Charles J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Veatch, William M., XXXXX.
 Wagner, Clyde W., Jr., XXXXX.
 Washburn, Kenneth B., XXXXX.

To be captain, Dental Corps

Balaban, Bernard, XXXXX.
 Bohanan, Jack R., XXXXX.
 Cheney, Daniel K., XXXXX.
 DuPont, Albert A., XXXXX.
 Hirsch, Edward H., XXXXX.
 Huguet, Eugene F., XXXXX.
 Morgan, James K., XXXXX.
 Nelson, Robert N., XXXXX.
 Rodenburg, Carl E., XXXXX.
 Schwartz, Roy S., XXXXX.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Bucci, Thomas J., XXXXX.
 Edwards, George C., XXXXX.
 Farris, Richard D., XXXXX.
 Ferrell, John F., XXXXX.
 Hunt, Ronald D., XXXXX.
 Jorgensen, Robert R., XXXXX.
 Spertzel, Richard O., XXXXX.
 Voelker, Richard W., Jr., XXXXX.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Allgood, Gerald D., XXXXX.
 Amidon, Charles D., Jr., XXXXX.
 Barber, Leroy M., Jr., XXXXX.
 Bayne, Calvin, XXXXX.
 Bissell, Donald F., XXXXX.
 Bowes, Donald J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Broadfoot, Bobby E., XXXXX.
 Brown, George L., XXXXX.
 Browning, Robert D., XXXXX.
 Bryant, Robert J., XXXXX.
 Bunce, George E., XXXXX.
 Burris, Norman L., XXXXX.
 Casasanta, John J., XXXXX.
 Cedola, Vincent J., XXXXX.
 Charlton, John L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Clark, Harry H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Clegg, George J., XXXXX.
 Cooper, James D., XXXXX.
 Cornwall, Ralph W., XXXXX.
 Crawford, John C., XXXXX.
 Crenshaw, William A., XXXXX.
 Crosley, John K., XXXXX.
 Dacus, Lester H., XXXXX.
 Danielson, John J., XXXXX.
 Darnauer, Paul F., XXXXX.
 Dawson, William J., XXXXX.
 Eberwine, James A., XXXXX.
 Eldridge, Bruce F., XXXXX.
 Fisher, George A., XXXXX.
 Geringer, Gerald G., XXXXX.
 Gossage, Donald R., XXXXX.
 Gourley, John H., XXXXX.
 Gulevich, Wladimir, XXXXX.
 Harding, Clarence E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Harris, Davis P., XXXXX.
 Haswell, Edward A., XXXXX.
 Heldmyer, Harry F., XXXXX.
 Heriot, Richard M., XXXXX.
 Herdon, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hickley, George J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hill, William D., XXXXX.
 Hudson, James F., XXXXX.
 Hull, Donald R., XXXXX.
 Inge, Bobby M., XXXXX.
 Jordan, France F., XXXXX.
 La Luzerne, Ronald J., XXXXX.
 Levy, Louis B., XXXXX.
 Liedtka, Frederick A., XXXXX.
 Linder, William W., XXXXX.
 Lupien, Earle E., XXXXX.
 Maeder, Donald F., XXXXX.
 McGinnis, John W., XXXXX.
 McKain, Jerry L., XXXXX.
 Mealey, John J., Jr., XXXXX.
 Mills, Freddie J., XXXXX.
 Moran, Homer B., XXXXX.
 Muglia, Joseph R., XXXXX.
 Murphy, John W., XXXXX.
 Murray, Ernest C., XXXXX.
 Murrell, Dan S., XXXXX.
 Naylor, Donald L., XXXXX.
 Neitzel, Richard F., XXXXX.

Oswalt, Harris G., XXXXX.
 Otterstedt, Charles C., Junior, XXXXX.

Pantalone, Julius D., XXXXX.

Phillips, Finos J., XXXXX.

Piercy, John P., XXXXX.

Pitchford, Thomas L., XXXXX.

Pitts, William P., XXXXX.

Powell, Harold W., XXXXX.

Pulcini, Dino J., XXXXX.

Romero, Daniel J., XXXXX.

Sande, Sigvert, XXXXX.

Santori, Luis A., XXXXX.

Seeley, Sam T., XXXXX.

Shaw, Dale L., XXXXX.

Snell, John T., XXXXX.

Steinberg, Marshall C., XXXXX.

Stevenson, Wilbert, XXXXX.

Stowe, Charles L., XXXXX.

Stubblefield, James B., Jr., XXXXX.

Sutton, Mark R., XXXXX.

Thornburg, Lamonte F., XXXXX.

Timmens, James M., XXXXX.

Turner, James G., XXXXX.

Upham, Robert W., Jr., XXXXX.

Van Nus, Frederick, XXXXX.

Van Straten, James G., XXXXX.

Van Wyck, William E., XXXXX.

Villanueva, Teodoro, Jr., XXXXX.

Vining, John F., 3d, XXXXX.

Walls, Neal H., XXXXX.

Wangemann, Robert T., XXXXX.

Wilburn, James H., XXXXX.

Wilson, Robert G., XXXXX.

Wood, Malcolm H., Jr., XXXXX.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Anderson, Helen G., XXXXX.

Farrell, Joanne T., XXXXX.

Garmon, Betty L., XXXXX.

Gilbrech, Carmen E., XXXXX.

Gregory, Barbara A., XXXXX.

Hanson, Carol L., XXXXX.

Jaskoski, Margaret L., XXXXX.

Johnson, Hazel W., XXXXX.

O'Rourke, Gwendolyn L., XXXXX.

Sandness, Elizabeth A., XXXXX.

Sullivan, Elenore F., XXXXX.

Tauscher, Etta R., XXXXX.

Yoder, Ann E., XXXXX.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Brown, Eloise A., XXXX.

Dobbs, Eunice R., XXXX.

Fritsch, Ann D., XXXX.

Hyde, Patricia L., XXXX.

McDowell, Joyce, XXXX.

Pause, Barbara E., XXXX.

Thompson, Margaret E., XXXX.

Yeakel, Mary H., XXXX.

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 lieutenant

Adair, Robert B., XXXXX.

Adams, Frank S., XXXXX.

Adams, Glen T., XXXXX.

Adams, Ralph E., Jr., XXXXX.

Adams, Robert T., XXXXX.

Adams, Wilsie H., Jr., XXXXX.

Adderley, David L., XXXXX.

Aikman, Larry P., XXXXX.

Alban, John H., Jr., XXXXX.

Aldridge, Jesse C., XXXXX.

Alexander, Don R., XXXXX.

Alexander, Joseph D., XXXXX.

Algire, Robert T., XXXXX.

Allen, Alex L., XXXXX.

Allen, Donald K., XXXXX.

Allen, Lee, XXXXX.

Amirault, Robert J., XXXXX.

Ammerman, Robert H., Jr., XXXXX.

Anchors, Donald A., XXXXX.

Anderson, Powell R., XXXXX.

Anderson, Robert A., XXXXX.

Anderson, Warren H., XXXXX.

Andrews, Raymond S., Jr., XXXXX.

Andrews, William C., XXXXX.

Appell, Michael N., XXXXX.

Applegarth, Donald L., XXXXX.

Arthur, Warren A., XXXXX.

Ash, Hughes L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ax, George R., XXXXXX
 Bailey, William N., Jr., XXXX
 Baker, Anthony D., XXXXXX
 Baker, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Baldwin, Edward R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Baldwin, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Balfanz, William F., XXXXXX
 Bara, Thaddeus J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bare, George P., XXXX
 Barone, Ercole M., XXXX
 Barr, Allyn J., XXXXXX
 Barrell, Donald H., XXXXXX
 Barrows, Raymond R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bartelt, Roger L., XXXXXX
 Bauer, David W., XXXXXX
 Baur, James F., XXXXXX
 Baxter, George J., XXXXXX
 Beaudin, Lawrence A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Beavers, Leslie E., XXXXXX
 Beck, William F., XXXXXX
 Belan, Charles G., XXXXXX
 Belanger, David P., XXXXXX
 Bellisle, Philip R., XXXXXX
 Bellis, Edward A., 3d, XXXXXX
 Beltz, Ronald A., XXXXXX
 Bennett, James L., XXXXXX
 Bennett, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Bernstein, Joel E., XXXXXX
 Berry, John A., 3d, XXXXXX
 Berti, John R., XXXXXX
 Bertocci, David L., XXXXXX
 Bibb, Randolph T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bidgood, Ferdinand C., XXXXXX
 Bierly, Robert N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bingham, James W., XXXXXX
 Biondi, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Bireley, Judson L., XXXXXX
 Blackstone, Anthony H., XXXXXX
 Blake, Phillip L., XXXXXX
 Blanton, John R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Blewett, John H., XXXXXX
 Blitch, William T., XXXXXX
 Bloch, Arthur LeR., XXXXXX
 Bochnowski, Frank J., XXXXXX
 Bogart, William V., XXXXXX
 Bohn, Joseph P., XXXXXX
 Bomersheim, Phil K., XXXXXX
 Bonifay, Issaac F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Booker, James A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Borg, Charles T., XXXXXX
 Boucher, Arthur G., XXXXXX
 Bowden, John T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bowden, Kenneth C., XXXXXX
 Bowers, Joseph M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bowersox, Wilbur G., XXXXXX
 Boyd, Richard K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Boyd, William L., XXXXXX
 Boyles, Harry W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bradford, Larry N., XXXXXX
 Bradley, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Bradley, William A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Brady, Edward J., XXXXXX
 Brand, Harold J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bratz, Gordon T., XXXXXX
 Brennan, Ambrose W., XXXXXX
 Brett, William W., XXXXXX
 Brickey, William E., XXXXXX
 Brindley, Peter, XXXXXX
 Brisach, Eugene M., XXXXXX
 Britz, Ronald J., XXXXXX
 Brown, Charles C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Brown, James H., XXXXXX
 Brown, Jay S., XXXXXX
 Brownfield, Harold A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Brugh, Larry D., XXXX
 Brumblay, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Brux, Gary H., XXXXXX
 Bryant, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Buchanan, Frank B., 3d, XXXXXX
 Bullock, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Bumgardner, William H., XXXXXX
 Bunten, Ralph T., Jr., XXXX
 Bunting, Bertram A., XXXXXX
 Burden, John R., XXXXXX
 Burnell, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Burns, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Burns, Timothy F., XXXXXX
 Bury, Robert H., XXXX
 Busch, John M., XXXXXX
 Butler, David H., XXXXXX
 Byrnes, David F., XXXXXX
 Cabaniss, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cafky, James W., XXXXXX
 Caldwell, Joseph G., XXXXXX
 Caldwell, Ora O., XXXXXX
 Caldwell, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Caldwell, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Callahan, Joseph C., XXXXXX
 Calverase, Francis J., XXXXXX
 Calvin, Harry C., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Dan H., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Jack A., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Richard J., XXXX
 Canant, Raymond G., XXXXXX
 Cannon, Joe M., XXXXXX
 Caraballo, Julian T., XXXXXX
 Carey, Arthur T., XXXXXX
 Carlile, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Carlton, Terry M., XXXXXX
 Carmean, Clayton H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Carnaghi, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Carpenter, William S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Carr, John M., XXXXXX
 Carter, Kevin R., XXXXXX
 Carville, Louis A., 3d, XXXXXX
 Cary, John B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cary, Martin W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Casey, John L., XXXXXX
 Castleman, Robert J., Jr., XXXX
 Cato, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Cavender, Jerry W., XXXXXX
 Celichowski, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Cerjan, Paul G., XXXXXX
 Chabot, Brion V., XXXXXX
 Chader, Gordon H., XXXXXX
 Chaffin, Harry J., XXXXXX
 Chamberlain, William F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Champ, Alan D., XXXXXX
 Chapman, Don C., XXXXXX
 Chapman, Gerald, Jr., XXXXXX
 Chappell, Phillip E., XXXXXX
 Chase, William C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Chitren, Vincent R., XXXXXX
 Choplick, James R., XXXXXX
 Clancy, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Clark, Claude L., XXXXXX
 Clark, Daniel R., XXXXXX
 Clark, Herbert N., XXXXXX
 Clark, Jack L., XXXXXX
 Clay, Wayne, XXXXXX
 Cleale, Conrad S., XXXXXX
 Cleaver, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Clement, Gregory C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Click, David L., XXXXXX
 Coffey, Lawrence R., Jr., XXXX
 Cole, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Cole, Theodore R., XXXXXX
 Collins, Charles D., 3d, XXXXXX
 Comfort, Gary L., XXXXXX
 Cook, Clyde L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cooper, Milton E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Coose, Alonzo, Jr., XXXXXX
 Copeland, Clinso, Jr., XXXXXX
 Costa, Joseph, Jr., XXXXXX
 Costa, Louis P., XXXXXX
 Cote, Joseph R., XXXXXX
 Court, Reginald D., XXXXXX
 Covian, James E., XXXXXX
 Covell, Stilman D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cox, Richard L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Creighton, William S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cremer, Frank N., XXXXXX
 Cressall, William F., XXXXXX
 Croel, Philip M., XXXXXX
 Croll, Gerald F., XXXXXX
 Crosby, George T., XXXXXX
 Crossley, Ross W., XXXXXX
 Crowley, Edward M., XXXXXX
 Crum, Edward W., XXXXXX
 Crump, John C., XXXXXX
 Crutchfield, Ralph LeR., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cruz-Casado, Hector, XXXXXX
 Cullins, Ross H., XXXXXX
 Cully, William J., XXXXXX
 Culp, Richard B., XXXXXX
 Cummings, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Cummings, Patrick W., XXXX
 Cushman, James McR., XXXXXX
 Danforth, William W., XXXXXX
 Daniel, James P., XXXXXX
 Daniel, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Danielsen, Theodore S., XXXX
 Darden, Harold W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Darling, Dean H., XXXXXX
 Darling, Merlin D., XXXXXX
 Dascanio, John L., XXXXXX
 Daum, Richard S., XXXXXX
 Davidson, Robert B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Davis, Joal LeR., XXXXXX
 Davis, Lynn E., XXXXXX
 Day, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Dawdy, William F., XXXXXX
 Deagle, Edwin A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dean, Arthur J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dearing, David P., XXXXXX
 Deaton, Jones T., Jr., XXXXXX
 DeBolt, Harold F., XXXXXX
 Decker, Roger B., XXXXXX
 Decko, Charles C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Del Favero, Robert V., XXXX
 DeLoach, Javan M., XXXXXX
 DelPonti, John D., XXXXXX
 Denton, John R., Jr., XXXXXX
 DePew, John C., XXXXXX
 Desgroseilliers, Ronald P., XXXXXX
 DeWitt, John L., 3d, XXXXXX
 Dice, Denis C., XXXXXX
 Dice, Jack W., XXXXXX
 Diebold, Jerome A., XXXXXX
 Dieker, Lawrence L., XXXXXX
 Dinsmore, Paul F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dlugopolski, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Donahue, Daniel J., XXXXXX
 Donahue, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Donaldson, Benjamin L., XXXXXX
 Dorf, Daniel J., XXXXXX
 Dorsey, Ira, XXXXXX
 Dougalas, James A., XXXXXX
 Downey, John T., XXXXXX
 Doyle, William J., XXXXXX
 Drake, Earle A., XXXXXX
 Drake, Edmond H., XXXXXX
 Dreibelbis, Harold N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Drewfs, Henry F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Drisko, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Driver, Lewis F., 3d, XXXXXX
 Drollinger, William O., XXXXXX
 Drumheller, Ronald E., XXXXXX
 Dubov, Bruce J., XXXXXX
 Duncan, Wallace H., XXXXXX
 Dunham, Rockwood S., XXXXXX
 Dunlap, Albert J., XXXXXX
 DuPont, Arnold R., XXXXXX
 Durham, John W., XXXXXX
 Duryea, Lyman C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dwyre, Charles M., XXXXXX
 Dyer, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Dynes, John H., XXXXXX
 Eckert, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Eckmann, Michael R., XXXXXX
 Edelstein, Rand, XXXXXX
 Edgette, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Edwards, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Elder, Cecil W., XXXXXX
 Elder, Jack E., XXXXXX
 Ellis, David E., XXXXXX
 Endicott, James A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Endy, Clarence E., Jr., XXXX
 Epley, Gerald G., Jr., XXXX
 Erickson, William C., XXXXXX
 Estes, Robert F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Eubanks, Earl W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Eubanks, Herman T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Evans, Benjamin F., 3d, XXXXXX
 Everbach, Otto G., XXXXXX
 Eynon, Thomas F., 3d, XXXXXX
 Faery, Henry F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fairchild, James B., XXXXXX
 Fairweather, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fanning, John J., 3d, XXXXXX
 Fanning, John P., XXXXXX
 Farrell, Francis W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fasching, George H., XXXXXX
 Fay, William P., XXXXXX
 Fecht, Jack A., XXXXXX
 Federico, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Fedynak, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 Fegan, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Felber, Joseph G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fenton, Roland D., XXXXXX
 Ferguson, George A., Jr., XXXXXX

Ferguson, Jack H., XXXXXX.
 Ferguson, Michael L., XXXXXX.
 Fero, James P., XXXXXX.
 Ferrence, Paul F., XXXXXX.
 Field, Michael F., XXXXXX.
 Fields, Harold T. Jr., XXXXXX.
 Fields, James C., XXXXXX.
 Fiero, Robert S., XXXXXX.
 Finley, George A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Finn, Frank D., XXXXXX.
 Fioravanti, Domenic A., XXXXXX.
 Flaenery, Eugene P., XXXXXX.
 Flanagan, Thomas P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Flint, Walker H., XXXXXX.
 Florence, William E., XXXXXX.
 Floyd, Howard J., XXXXXX.
 Flynn, Dennis J., XXXXXX.
 Forbus, Jere K., XXXXXX.
 Forster, Franz J., XXXXXX.
 Fortier, Joseph E., 3d., XXXXXX.
 Fourson, George R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Fowler, Donald E., XXXXXX.
 Fox, Nathaniel S., XXXXXX.
 Foye, Robert, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Francis, Robert G., XXXXXX.
 Frank, John J., XXXXXX.
 Frankenberger, Charles E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Frasche, Louis D. F., XXXXXX.
 Fraser, Howard D., XXXXXX.
 Freitag, William W., XXXXXX.
 French, William C., XXXXXX.
 Frigard, George C., XXXXXX.
 Fritts, Courtney R., XXXXXX.
 Fritts, William D., XXXXXX.
 Fritz, James E., XXXXXX.
 Frost, Dean R., XXXXXX.
 Furey, Bartley W., XXXXXX.
 Fyfe, John C., XXXXXX.
 Gabrysiak, Walter J., XXXXXX.
 Gagliano, Ross A., XXXXXX.
 Gallo, Charles L., XXXXXX.
 Gannett, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Garcia, Jose, XXXXXX.
 Garcia, Miguel A., XXXXXX.
 Garner, George K., XXXXXX.
 Garrity, John J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Garton, Edward R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Garvey, James G., XXXXXX.
 Gates, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Geehr, Richard S., XXXXXX.
 Geiger, John F., XXXXXX.
 Geisinger, John L., XXXXXX.
 German, Abraham L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Germann, Anthony C., XXXXXX.
 Getgood, John H., XXXXXX.
 Giacoppe, George N., XXXXXX.
 Gianelloni, Sabin J., 3d., XXXXXX.
 Gibbs, Homer J., XXXXXX.
 Gibbs, John J., XXXXXX.
 Gibbs, John S., XXXXXX.
 Glick, George P., XXXXXX.
 Giese, Arthur M., XXXXXX.
 Gigicos, Chris G., XXXXXX.
 Gilliland, Jerrold L., XXXXXX.
 Gill, Terrance M., XXXXXX.
 Gillespie, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Gillespie, Wayne G., XXXXXX.
 Gilmartin, Michael W., XXXXXX.
 Glaser, Kenneth R., XXXXXX.
 Gledhill, David W., XXXXXX.
 Godwin, James S., XXXXXX.
 Good, Walter R., XXXXXX.
 Goodman, Michael L., XXXXXX.
 Goto, Arthur K., XXXXXX.
 Graham, Leonard T., XXXXXX.
 Grande, Vincent G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Grattan, Brian T., XXXXXX.
 Gratzer, Bernard W., 3d., XXXXXX.
 Graves, Forrest V., XXXXXX.
 Green, Edward R., XXXXXX.
 Greene, Richard McD., XXXXXX.
 Greenhaw, Thomas W., XXXXXX.
 Greif, William J., XXXXXX.
 Grier, Edward G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Griffis, Fletcher H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Griffith, Eugene D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Griffith, Fenton H., XXXXXX.
 Griggs, Joe H., XXXXXX.
 Guest, James A., XXXXXX.
 Guggenheim, Max, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Guindon, Richard G., XXXXX.

Gulla, John F., XXXXXX.
 Gunter, William J., XXXXXX.
 Hackett, Robert T. G., XXXXXX.
 Hagan, Carig A., XXXXXX.
 Hagen, Lars B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hall, Frederic B., 3d., XXXXXX.
 Halley, Fred N., XXXXXX.
 Hallihan, James J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Halsall, Ronald W., XXXXXX.
 Hamilton, George A., XXXXXX.
 Hanne, William G., XXXXXX.
 Hapeman, Elmer R., XXXXXX.
 Harcke, Howard T., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hardenburg, William J., XXXXXX.
 Harder, Frederick R., XXXXXX.
 Hardin, Alva V., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hardy, Albert S., 3d., XXXXXX.
 Harmon, William E., XXXXXX.
 Harnagel, William R., XXXXXX.
 Harris, Martin J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Harrison, Kent E., XXXXXX.
 Hart, Edward D., XXXXXX.
 Hasenel, Gordon J., XXXXXX.
 Hastings, Walter D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hatcher, Michael J., XXXXXX.
 Haycraft, Thomas J., XXXXXX.
 Hays, Loyd J., XXXXXX.
 Healy, Richard W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hebert, John M., XXXXXX.
 Heckman, George M., XXXXXX.
 Helbock, Richard W., XXXXXX.
 Henderson, Arthur L., XXXXXX.
 Hendrickson, Christopher P., XXXXXX.
 Henigsman, David N., XXXXXX.
 Henry, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Henry, George E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Henry, Larry F., XXXXXX.
 Herman, Dean A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hernaiz, Alfonso M., XXXXXX.
 Herrick, Curtis J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Herrling, John P., XXXXXX.
 Herrmann, Gerald E., XXXXXX.
 Hervert, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Herzog, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Hesford, John P., XXXXXX.
 Hickey, John F., XXXXXX.
 Hickman, Stanford W., XXXXXX.
 Hidalgo, Manuel A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hill, Kenneth R., XXXXXX.
 Hindman, John E., XXXXXX.
 Hinds, Jim E., XXXXXX.
 Hittner, Anthony L., XXXXXX.
 Hixson, John A., XXXXXX.
 Hoaas, John G., XXXXXX.
 Hodel, Gerhardt W., XXXXXX.
 Hodge, David L., XXXXXX.
 Hoffman, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Hogan, Donald D., XXXXXX.
 Hogarth, John D., XXXXXX.
 Hohnan, Roger D., XXXXXX.
 Holland, James C., XXXXXX.
 Holland, Patrick J., XXXXXX.
 Holleman, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Holmes, Allen E., XXXXXX.
 Holmes, Simon H., XXXXXX.
 Honda, Harry T., XXXXXX.
 Hoover, Richard L., XXXXXX.
 Hoppe, Howard J., XXXXXX.
 Hopper, James A., XXXXXX.
 Horton, Leland H., XXXXXX.
 Hourihan, William J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 House, John C., XXXXXX.
 Householder, James C., XXXXXX.
 Houston, Darrell G., XXXXXX.
 Howell, Eugene A., XXXXXX.
 Hubbard, John B., XXXXXX.
 Hubbard, Donald A., XXXXXX.
 Hubbard, Johnny R., XXXXXX.
 Huber, Thomas H., XXXXXX.
 Huffine, Melvin T., XXXXXX.
 Hug, Jack P., XXXXXX.
 Hughes, Patrick R., XXXXXX.
 Humes, Jack T., XXXXXX.
 Humphrey, Theodore R., XXXXXX.
 Humphreys, James E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hunter, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Hutcheson, John D., XXXXXX.
 Hutchison, Joseph W., XXXXXX.
 Hynd, John W., XXXXXX.
 Ichiyama, Ronald S., XXXXXX.
 Isham, George F., XXXXXX.
 Jackson, Charles H., Sr., XXXXXX.
 Jacques, Joseph N., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Jaekel, Richard A., XXXXXX.
 Janszen, James H., XXXXXX.
 Jarrett, Jay H., XXXXXX.
 Jarvis, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Jascewsky, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Jenrette, Albert W., XXXXXX.
 Jensen, Marvin R., XXXXXX.
 Jeszensky, John F., XXXXXX.
 Jezior, Michael A., XXXXXX.
 Jhung, Grafton, XXXXXX.
 Jilbert, Gerald R., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Alan E., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Anthony, XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Frederick A., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, James B., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, James H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Robert N., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Thomas M., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Thomas W., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, William LeR., XXXXXX.
 Johnston, Frederick E., 3d., XXXXXX.
 Johnston, Joseph W., II, XXXXXX.
 Jones, Arland A., XXXXXX.
 Jones, Homer W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Jordan, Paul G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Jordan, William J., XXXXXX.
 Joyce, Larry E., XXXXXX.
 Judson, Arthur E., XXXXXX.
 Kaiser, George F., XXXXXX.
 Kaiser, Harold F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Kane, George R., XXXXXX.
 Kane, James R., XXXXXX.
 Kane, John J., XXXXXX.
 Kane, John P., XXXXXX.
 Kane, John R., XXXXXX.
 Kanemori, Claude H., XXXXXX.
 Karaman, James W., XXXXXX.
 Keane, John K., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Keating, Albert C., XXXXXX.
 Keene, Jack R., XXXXXX.
 Kelley, Samuel P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Kelly, Robert R., XXXXXX.
 Kelly, William F., XXXXXX.
 Kiernan, Thomas J., XXXXXX.
 Killingstad, Karl P., XXXXXX.
 King, Jack J., XXXXXX.
 King, James R., XXXXXX.
 King, Kenneth L., XXXXXX.
 King, Lyell F., XXXXXX.
 Kinkade, David R., XXXXXX.
 Kirchner, Kenneth R., XXXXXX.
 Klein, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Kleinstiver, Lloyd W., XXXXXX.
 Kling, Larry V., XXXXXX.
 Klosek, James W., XXXXXX.
 Klosen, Douglas F., XXXXXX.
 Kniskern, Bruce E., XXXXXX.
 Kobayashi, Norman T., XXXXXX.
 Kobza, Gene R., XXXXXX.
 Koehler, Douglas T., XXXXXX.
 Kolodziejski, Anthony J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Kopecky, Robert J., XXXXXX.
 Kopp, Thomas E., XXXXXX.
 Kouns, Darryle L., XXXXXX.
 Krahe, Francis X., XXXXXX.
 Krape, Darryl S., XXXXXX.
 Kuhn, Wayne B., XXXXXX.
 Kuklinski, Norman J., XXXXXX.
 Kulish, Jon N., XXXXXX.
 Kuypers, Thomas O., XXXXXX.
 Kwasny, Philip M., XXXXXX.
 Labat, Roger J., XXXXXX.
 LaBlonde, George T., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lacey, William G., XXXXXX.
 Ladehoff, Harold L., XXXXXX.
 LaForgia, Salvatore F., XXXXXX.
 Lagasse, Peter F., XXXXXX.
 Laird, William R., XXXXXX.
 Lambert, Joseph R., XXXXXX.
 Lang, William A., XXXXXX.
 Langseth, Leslie G., XXXXXX.
 Laurence, Edward J., XXXXXX.
 Lawson, Edward K., 3d., XXXXXX.
 Leamy, Charles D., XXXXXX.
 Learned, Samuel M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lee, Gene H., XXXXXX.
 Lee, Henry, XXXX.
 Lee, Stanley M., XXXXXX.

Leech, Robert L., XXXXX
 Leedy, Eugene B., XXXX
 LeFebvre, John A., XXXXX
 Le Gath, Joseph S., XXXXX
 Lehrer, Glenn H., XXXXX
 Lemmer, John F., XXXXX
 Lenti, John M., XXXXX
 Leonard, Charles F., 3d, XXXXX
 Leonard, James E., XXXXX
 Leach, Irving A., XXXXX
 Letonoff, Victor T., XXXXX
 Leuty, Ray S., XXXXX
 Lewis, Jerome X., 2d, XXXXX
 Lewis, Sterling M., Jr., XXXXX
 Lincoln, James B., XXXXX
 Linebaugh, John M., XXXXX
 Linton, James E., XXXXX
 Littlewood, Arthur R., 3d, XXXXX
 Livingston, Gordon S., XXXXX
 Logsdon, Lawrence J., XXXXX
 Lohr, Richard A., XXXXX
 Loomis, Leonard J., XXXXX
 Lopez-Sanchez, Andres, XXXXX
 Loscuito, Ned N., Jr., XXXXX
 Lott, George B., Jr., XXXXX
 Lotz, Reinhard M., XXXXX
 Loundenslager, Max J., XXXXX
 Lovsnes, Neal W., Jr., XXXXX
 Lowrey, Marl P., XXXXX
 Lowry, Mark, 2d, XXXXX
 Lucas, Joseph C., XXXXX
 Ludovici, Kenneth R., XXXXX
 Lusky, Harold H., XXXXX
 Luster, Ira T., Jr., XXXXX
 Luton, Charles G., XXXXX
 Lynch, David F., XXXXX
 Lynch, Michael J., XXXXX
 Lynn, Frederick J., XXXXX
 MacAulay, David J., XXXXX
 Macinko, James A., XXXXX
 Mackin, John P., Jr., XXXXX
 MacLachlan, Peter, XXXXX
 Maddox, Edward R., Jr., XXXXX
 Madison, Richard J., XXXXX
 Maginnis, Thomas P., XXXXX
 Maguire, Michael E., XXXXX
 Maksimowski, Ferdinand, Jr., XXXXX
 Mallardi, Robert N., XXXXX
 Maloney, William H., XXXXX
 Mandelbaum, Charles E., XXXXX
 Mandry, Paul W., XXXXX
 Manley, Edward J., Jr., XXXXX
 Marcinkowski, Robert D., XXXXX
 Marcy, Spencer D., XXXXX
 Marks, Samuel L., XXXXX
 Marmon, Herman S., XXXXX
 Marotta, Joseph R., XXXXX
 Marshall, Dahl, XXXXX
 Marshall, Marion H., XXXXX
 Martin, John A., XXXXX
 Martin, Stanley J., XXXXX
 Martin, Williams S., XXXXX
 Martone, Patrick N., XXXXX
 Martz, John R., XXXXX
 Mason, John T., 3d, XXXXX
 Mason, Leslie P., Jr., XXXXX
 Maurer, Raymond W., XXXXX
 Mawhorter, T. J., Jr., XXXXX
 Mayo, John O., Jr., XXXXX
 McCahan, Alan R., XXXXX
 McCarthy, Daniel J., XXXXX
 McCollum, James K., XXXXX
 McCormick, James P., XXXXX
 McCormick, Michael H., XXXXX
 McElroy, George J., XXXXX
 McFaull, William N., 3d, XXXXX
 McGance, Philip V., XXXXX
 McGahey, Martin N., Jr., XXXXX
 McGough, James B., Jr., XXXXX
 McGushin, Edward F., XXXXX
 McInerney, Richard N., XXXXX
 McKee, Michael R., XXXXX
 McKinney, John J., XXXXX
 McLaughlin, Eugene J., XXXXX
 McManus, George H., XXXXX
 McNamara, William T., XXXXX
 McPherson, Thomas H., XXXXX
 McQuillen, George P., XXXXX
 McWain, James T., XXXXX
 Meany, George E., XXXXX
 Mease, Jennings H., XXXXX

Medenbach, Philip C., XXXXX
 Melcher, John F., Jr., XXXXX
 Menzner, Robert J., XXXXX
 Mercado, Robert K., XXXXX
 Meriaux, Richard D., XXXXX
 Merlick, Carroll W., XXXXX
 Merrill, Sherburn W., Jr., XXXXX
 Meyers, Robert W., Jr., XXXXX
 Michels, Raymond D., XXXXX
 Mierau, Michael D., XXXXX
 Miles, John L., Jr., XXXXX
 Miles, Paul L., Jr., XXXXX
 Miller, Bill E., XXXXX
 Miller, Carl D., XXXXX
 Miller, Dyson R. C., XXXXX
 Miller, George P., XXXXX
 Miller, Gerald C., XXXXX
 Miller, John Z., Jr., XXXXX
 Miller, Richard S., XXXXX
 Mills, Robert H., XXXXX
 Minick, John M., XXXXX
 Miser, Robert S., Jr., XXXXX
 Misura, John P., XXXXX
 Mitchell, Edwin A., XXXXX
 Mitchell, Stuart G., XXXXX
 Mitchell, Tilden A., 3d, XXXXX
 Mollohan, Keith C., XXXXX
 Molskow, Thomas S., XXXXX
 Montgomery, John P., XXXXX
 Montgomery, Robert E., Jr., XXXXX
 Mooney, Michael J., XXXXX
 Moore, Frederick T., 3d, XXXXX
 Moore, Thomas P., Jr., XXXXX
 Morabit, Joseph L., XXXXX
 Morgan, Charles H., XXXXX
 Morgan, Douglas S., XXXXX
 Morgan, Kearney H., Jr., XXXXX
 Morin, Reynold, XXXXX
 Morse, Thomas McN., XXXXX
 Morrison, Robert G., XXXXX
 Morton, John A., XXXXX
 Mosbrooker, Michael L., XXXXX
 Mostek, Donald S., XXXXX
 Mowery, Hartman B., Jr., XXXXX
 Muck, Jack LeR., XXXXX
 Muehlberger, Albert A., XXXXX
 Mulholland, Robert B., Jr., XXXXX
 Munson, Don B., XXXXX
 Murphy, Robert C., XXXXX
 Murphy, William F., XXXXX
 Murray, Marvin R., Jr., XXXXX
 Murrill, Fredrik H., XXXXX
 Myers, Robert M., XXXXX
 Myers, William N., Jr., XXXXX
 Naatjes, Clarence S., XXXXX
 Nadeau, Joseph E., XXXXX
 Naftzinger, Joseph E., XXXXX
 Napier, Brian T., XXXXX
 Neely, Charles R., XXXXX
 NeeSmith, Delmus M., XXXXX
 Nehammer, Karl F., XXXXX
 Nelson, Charles R., XXXXX
 Nelson, George W., Jr., XXXXX
 Nelson, Landy T., XXXXX
 Nevins, Bruce S., XXXXX
 Newman, John R., XXXXX
 Nichols, John W., XXXXX
 Noble, George P., 3d, XXXXX
 Nobles, Charles S., XXXXX
 Noel, Thomas E., 3d, XXXXX
 Nolan, Howard J., XXXXX
 Norman, William L., XXXXX
 Norton, Dale F., XXXXX
 O'Brey, Earman D., XXXXX
 O'Brien, Joel T., XXXXX
 O'Brien, Richard J., XXXXX
 O'Brien, Thomas F., 3d, XXXXX
 O'Connell, James T., Jr., XXXXX
 O'Connor, Roy J., Jr., XXXXX
 Oerding, James B., XXXXX
 O'Keefe, Joseph D., XXXXX
 O'Leary, Daniel L., XXXXX
 Oliver, John H., XXXXX
 O'Malley, Thomas K., XXXXX
 Orr, Danford M., XXXXX
 Oswandel, Robert E., XXXXX
 Ottstott, Charles P., XXXXX
 Overholser, William H., XXXXX
 Owens, Bobby L., XXXXX
 Paaso, Thomas H., XXXXX
 Pachosa, Matthew H., XXXXX
 Painter, Donald E., XXXXX
 Painter, William L., Jr., XXXXX
 Palm, Larry B., XXXXX
 Parent, Joseph W., XXXXX
 Parker, Eliot V., Jr., XXXXX
 Parker, Frank W., XXXXX
 Parker, Henry B., XXXXX
 Parker, Neal G., XXXXX
 Partlow, Frank A., Jr., XXXXX
 Patch, Robert W., XXXXX
 Patterson, Robert G., XXXXX
 Paulsen, Hans W., XXXXX
 Pearce, David L., XXXXX
 Pearl, James H., 2d, XXXXX
 Peilicci, Jack A., XXXXX
 Pepe, Michael J., XXXXX
 Perham, Whitman C., 2d, XXXXX
 Perkins, Randall A., Jr., XXXXX
 Peterson, Levi A., XXXXX
 Petter, David T., XXXXX
 Pitcher, Thomas B., XXXXX
 Pitts, Larry W., XXXXX
 Plummer, Frederick B., Jr., XXXXX
 Plummer, Michael T., XXXXX
 Pope, Fred R., XXXXX
 Post, Elwyn D., Jr., XXXXX
 Powers, James A., XXXXX
 Powers, Sidney H., XXXXX
 Prall, Eric L., XXXXX
 Presley, John R., XXXXX
 Prosser, Donald W., XXXXX
 Pyle, Richard G., XXXXX
 Queeney, Richard K., XXXXX
 Quinlan, John G., XXXXX
 Radike, David N., XXXXX
 Rains, Franklin D., XXXXX
 Ramos, James R., XXXXX
 Ramsey, Edward L., 3d, XXXXX
 Rapp, Charles G., XXXXX
 Rappaport, Arthur N., XXXXX
 Rau, Raymond R., XXXXX
 Raymond, Charles W., 3d, XXXXX
 Raymond, William M., XXXXX
 Reber, John L., XXXXX
 Redemann, David H., XXXXX
 Reece, Frank S., XXXXX
 Reed, Henry McD., 2d, XXXXX
 Ready, Clyde M., XXXXX
 Reese, Eugene P., Jr., XXXXX
 Reese, Robert W., XXXXX
 Reichard, Birge D., Jr., XXXXX
 Reid, John C., XXXXX
 Reiff, Jonathan D., XXXXX
 Remus, Ernest A., XXXXX
 Reynolds, Harry L., XXXXX
 Rice, Frederick C., XXXXX
 Rich, Terrence LaV., XXXXX
 Richards, David J., XXXXX
 Richeson, Alfred K., XXXXX
 Rider, Frank W., XXXXX
 Riley, Paul K., XXXXX
 Ritchie, William L., 2d, XXXXX
 Rivell, Gerard J., XXXXX
 Robbins, Chandler P., 3d, XXXXX
 Roberts, Paul A., XXXXX
 Robertson, Edward H., Jr., XXXXX
 Robinson, Tom A., XXXXX
 Robocker, William W., XXXXX
 Rollins, Melvin W., Jr., XXXXX
 Rose, Louis, XXXXX
 Rose, Richard G., XXXXX
 Ross, Kenneth L., XXXXX
 Rossman, Jack, XXXXX
 Roth, Howard W., Jr., XXXXX
 Rouse, Richard F., XXXXX
 Rowe, James N., XXXXX
 Rucker, Richmond W., XXXXX
 Rudesill, Robert S., XXXXX
 Ruedel, William P., XXXXX
 Rumbaugh, Max E., Jr., XXXXX
 Ruppert, James D., XXXXX
 Rux, William A., 2d, XXXXX
 Ryan, Joseph E., XXXXX
 Ryan, Michael F., XXXXX
 Ryan, Michael T., XXXXX
 Ryan, Roger McK., XXXXX
 Saalfrank, David C., XXXXX
 Safford, Donald B., XXXXX
 Sartoris, William W., XXXXX
 Saum, Clyde F., XXXX
 Savio, Paul J., XXXXX

Scanlon, Shaun J., ██████████.
 Schaaf, James C., Jr., ██████████.
 Schaefer, Grant A., ██████████.
 Schatzman, Thomas F., ██████████.
 Schiemann, Robert J., ██████████.
 Schmidt, Leroy A., ██████████.
 Schmidtman, Michael C., ██████████.
 Schmitt, Charles T., ██████████.
 Schofield, Richard T., Jr., ██████████.
 Schrankel, Charles R., ██████████.
 Schreiber, John H., Jr., ██████████.
 Schroeder, Frederick U., ██████████.
 Schuler, David B., ██████████.
 Schumann, Lawrence J., ██████████.
 Schweickert, William J., Jr., ██████████.
 Schwoob, James F., ██████████.
 Scott, Stephen H., ██████████.
 Scudder, William I., ██████████.
 Seagren, Eric H., ██████████.
 Searles, Jonathan W., ██████████.
 Seward, Richard S., ██████████.
 Seely, John B., ██████████.
 Sexton, William T., Jr., ██████████.
 Seymour, Roger G., ██████████.
 Shepherd, Billy J., ██████████.
 Sheppeck, Michael L., Jr., ██████████.
 Shevin, George L., Jr., ██████████.
 Shimek, Daniel W., ██████████.
 Shost, Alan T., ██████████.
 Shuey, Richard P., ██████████.
 Shumway, Richard S., ██████████.
 Sills, Edward G., ██████████.
 Simmons, Denis L., ██████████.
 Simpson, Andrew R., ██████████.
 Simpson, William C., ██████████.
 Skinner, William J., ██████████.
 Slattery, Stephen McL., ██████████.
 Slovacek, Anthony S., ██████████.
 Smilakis, Peter J., ██████████.
 Smith, Daniel A., ██████████.
 Smith, Donald E., ██████████.
 Smith, Harold B., ██████████.
 Smith, Irving B., ██████████.
 Snyder, Stephen J., ██████████.
 Sorensen, Ralph L., ██████████.
 Spain, William H., Jr., ██████████.
 Spangler, Robert LaV., ██████████.
 Spigarelli, Raymond F., ██████████.
 Spigelmire, Michael F., ██████████.
 Spin, William A., ██████████.
 Spivy, Berton E., 3d, ██████████.
 Sprengeler, Ronald J., ██████████.
 Sprinsky, William H., ██████████.
 Squire, Joseph W., ██████████.
 Stacy, Tommy J., ██████████.
 Stanfill, James H., ██████████.
 Stanley, George R., Jr., ██████████.
 Starling, James D., ██████████.
 Stauber, Jerome E., ██████████.
 Steele, John S., ██████████.
 Stehling, Joseph M., Jr., ██████████.
 Stem, David H., ██████████.
 Stephens, William J., ██████████.
 Stilwell, Joseph W., 3d, ██████████.
 Stockman, William L., 3d, ██████████.
 Stovall, Rayburn C., ██████████.
 Straetz, Donald F., ██████████.
 Strasbourg, Edward, ██████████.
 Strother, William M., Jr., ██████████.
 Strzelecki, Leonard S., ██████████.
 Stulga, Charles A., ██████████.
 Sturgeon, Charles E., ██████████.
 Sudginis, Joel E., ██████████.
 Sugg, Barney A., ██████████.
 Sullivan, Anthony D., ██████████.
 Sullivan, James A., Jr., ██████████.
 Summers, Don A., ██████████.
 Sutton, Adolph, Jr., ██████████.
 Sutton, David J., ██████████.
 Sutton, Richard O., Jr., ██████████.
 Swain, Paul C., ██████████.
 Swedberg, Robert C., ██████████.
 Symonds, Paul S., ██████████.
 Taggart, Homer G., ██████████.
 Tamplin, William F., Jr., ██████████.
 Tancredi, Roger J., Jr., ██████████.
 Taylor, Hurl R., Jr., ██████████.
 Taylor, John N., ██████████.
 Taylor, Thomas H., ██████████.
 Ten, Brook, James J., ██████████.
 Terry, Frederick G., Jr., ██████████.

Thacker, James F., ██████████.
 Thompson, Francis J., ██████████.
 Thompson, Olin R., Jr., ██████████.
 Thorne, Tommy L., ██████████.
 Thornton, William F., ██████████.
 Throckmorton, Thomas E., ██████████.
 Tichenor, James R., 3d, ██████████.
 Tillman, Clifford R., ██████████.
 Timmerman, Benjamin R., ██████████.
 Titmas, James A., ██████████.
 Titus, Charles M., ██████████.
 Totten, Robert G., ██████████.
 Tousey, Walter C., ██████████.
 Tozer, William S., ██████████.
 Trauner, Ronald F., ██████████.
 Trautmann, Eugene O., ██████████.
 Trickett, Frederick R., ██████████.
 Tripician, Philip A., ██████████.
 Tripp, Robert H., ██████████.
 Trodella, Robert A., ██████████.
 Trunk, dePaul R., ██████████.
 Tuxill, Richard W., ██████████.
 Tyre, David H., ██████████.
 Tyson, Richard L., ██████████.
 Valente, Thomas E., Jr., ██████████.
 Vaillant, Charles M., ██████████.
 Vanderslice, Gary E., ██████████.
 Van Riper, Thomas P., ██████████.
 Varnon, Jerry R., ██████████.
 Vaughan, Herbert E., ██████████.
 Veal, William T., Jr., ██████████.
 Vencill, William A., ██████████.
 Vermilyea, Carl P., ██████████.
 Vickers, Anthony M., ██████████.
 Waddell, Ralph L., ██████████.
 Wade, Milledge E., Jr., ██████████.
 Wagner, Richard W., ██████████.
 Walczak, Edward J., ██████████.
 Waldhour, Louis G., ██████████.
 Waldrop, Stephen F., ██████████.
 Waldrop, William R., ██████████.
 Walker, Clifford C., ██████████.
 Walker, Phillip A., Jr., ██████████.
 Waller, Bobbie J., ██████████.
 Walter, Richard E., ██████████.
 Waters, Russell A., ██████████.
 Watkins, Charlie C., ██████████.
 Watson, Henry C., 3d, ██████████.
 Watts, Pitt M., 3d, ██████████.
 Webb, Gerald E., ██████████.
 Wecker, David D., ██████████.
 Weiler, John E., Jr., ██████████.
 Weinhold, Robert W., ██████████.
 Welch, Michael N., ██████████.
 Wentworth, David B., ██████████.
 Whaples, Gene C., ██████████.
 Wharton, Gerald M., ██████████.
 Wheeler, Mason W., ██████████.
 White, Harry N., ██████████.
 White, James McE., ██████████.
 Whitehead, Floyd D., ██████████.
 Whitmore, Thomas N., ██████████.
 Wienser, Neil R., ██████████.
 Wild, Allen R., ██████████.
 Wildenthaler, Leo E., ██████████.
 Willey, Joseph P., ██████████.
 Wiley, Noble J., 3d, ██████████.
 Wilhelmi, Robert S., ██████████.
 Wilkes, John S., 3d, ██████████.
 Wilkie, David G., ██████████.
 Willauer, John H., ██████████.
 Williams, Charles E., ██████████.
 Williams, Larry M., ██████████.
 Williams, Lonnie B., Jr., ██████████.
 Willoughby, William H., Jr., ██████████.
 Wilson, Cyrus C., ██████████.
 Wilson, Daniel H., ██████████.
 Wilson, Gene R., ██████████.
 Wilson, James R., Jr., ██████████.
 Wilson, John H., ██████████.
 Wilson, Walter K., 3d, ██████████.
 Winchester, Wayne, ██████████.
 Windsor, Humphrey F., ██████████.
 Winston, Lawrence J., ██████████.
 Winters, Gerald F., ██████████.
 Wisby, James M., ██████████.
 Witcher, Robert A., ██████████.
 Witherspoon, Jerry W., ██████████.
 Witschard, Walter A., ██████████.
 Wolfarth, William M., Jr., XXXX.
 Wolff, James W., ██████████.

Wollmering, Lawrence E., ██████████.
 Wood, Anthony B., ██████████.
 Wood, Charles H., Jr., ██████████.
 Wood, John W., Jr., ██████████.
 Woodbeck, Charles A., ██████████.
 Wrockloff, George E., 3d, ██████████.
 Yamaguchi, Phillip T., ██████████.
 Yeager, William E., ██████████.
 Yeagley, John P., ██████████.
 York, James J., ██████████.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Barnes, Perry A., ██████████.
 Shannon, Sam Jr., ██████████.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be first lieutenant

Taylor, Horace G. (MSC), ██████████.

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

Clark, Richard W., Jr., ██████████.
 Grasbner, Siegfried L., ██████████.
 Heller, John M., ██████████.
 Keller, William K., ██████████.
 McKnight, Robert W., ██████████.
 Tambling, Robert F., ██████████.
 Temperley, Nicholas R., ██████████.
 Webster, William L., ██████████.

To be first lieutenants

DelRosso, Louis J., ██████████.
 Dierickx, James E., ██████████.
 Hall, John F., ██████████.
 Massabni, Fadlo M., ██████████.
 Schimming, James L., ██████████.
 Stewart, James T., ██████████.
 Williams, Richard L., ██████████.

To be second lieutenants

Anderson, Charles, Jr., ██████████.
 Brooks, William A., Jr., XXXX.
 Click, Ira N., ██████████.
 Henry, Patrick J., XXXX.
 Mathews, Kenneth J., ██████████.
 Sewell, Gerald L., ██████████.
 Volta, Donald H., ██████████.

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, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293 and 3294:

To be major, Medical Corps

Frankel, Alan L., XXXX.

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Archer, Donald E., ██████████.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Johnson, Lois V., ██████████.

To be captain, chaplain

Moore, Jesse W., ██████████.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bleich, Charles A., ██████████.
 Chinn, Clarence Y. L., ██████████.
 Connelly, Mark E., ██████████.
 Decker, Richard M., ██████████.
 Dusterwinkle, Sherwood A., ██████████.
 Filler, William H., ██████████.
 Houston, James E., ██████████.
 Karas, Richard P., ██████████.
 Singdahleen, Donald A., ██████████.
 Strock, Richard G., ██████████.
 Watts, Thomas R., ██████████.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Office

Taylor, Arthur H., ██████████.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Angello, Anthony L., ██████████.
 Anthony, Courtney L., Jr., ██████████.

Arzola, Ivan F., XXXXXXXX.
 Blount, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Brandel, George P., XXXXXX.
 Feltis, James M., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Figlock, Thaddeus A., XXXXXXXX.
 Hager, Harry G., XXXXXXXX.
 Jones, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Keller, Howard L., XXXXXXXX.
 Kimball, Frank B., XXXXXXXX.
 Konzen, Jon L., XXXXXXXX.
 Halloy, John P., XXXXXXXX.
 Manson, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.
 Martens, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX.
 Mayson, Preston B., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Morel, Donald E., XXXXXXXX.
 Mortenson, Francis N., XXXXXXXX.
 Omer, Lewis M., 3d., XXXXXXXX.
 Pollard, William R., XXXXXXXX.
 Rivera-Betancourt, Rafael A., XXXXXXXX.
 Schneider, Robert D., XXXXXXXX.
 Smith, Richard S., XXXXXXXX.
 Stambaugh, Roy A., XXXXXXXX.
 Sube, Janis, XXXXXXXX.
 Sullivan, James A., XXXXXXXX.
 Swanson, David L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Thomas, James A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Thompson, Robert L., XXXXXXXX.
 Walter, John D., XXXXXXXX.
 Webster, Stephen B., XXXXXXXX.
 Weeldreyer, Robert L., XXXXXXXX.
 Wimsett, Willard B.
 Zeigler, Michael G., XXXXXX.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps
 Loy, Vance A., XXXXXXXX.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps
 Whitney, Robert A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps
 LaMontagne, Mary E., XXXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Office

Heath, Stratton R., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Lavine, Sanford V., XXXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Bacon, William L., XXXXXXXX.
 Hutchison, James R., XXXXXXXX.
 Lillie, Homer J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Manuel, Wilbert J., XXXXXXXX.
 Nilges, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX.
 Phillips, Wesley F., XXXXXXXX.
 Robinson, Frederick C., XXXXXXXX.
 Schaaf, Daniel J., XXXXXXXX.
 Schufts, Boyd L., XXXXXXXX.
 Segal, Avron C., XXXXXXXX.
 Simmons, James W., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Stoller, Jerry J., XXXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps
 Walker, Jerry S., 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:

Fahle, Leroy D. Jones, Lewis M.
 Grosshans, John H. Megehee, Jacob H.
 Mace, James E. Witchelt, Roger H.

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, 3288 and 3288:

Adamick, Donald H. Bradford, John D.
 Anderson, Aggrey V. Brake, Perry F.
 Au, Larry W. Brassfield, Wallace W.
 Baird, Edmund C., Jr. Brewer, Thomas A.
 Balady, Salim J. Brinkley, Harley L.
 Banta, Theodore S., Jr. Brookshire, Carl W.
 Barber, Victor C. Brown, Gerald M.
 Barovetto, John L. Brown, Ruel R.
 Battlega, John A. Brunner, Harry J., Jr.
 Benson, Richard W. Butler, Johnny M.
 Black, John R. Byard, Johnny R.
 Bolme, Bruce M. Cady, Donald F.

Carletti, Stephen J. Mellon, Joe S., Jr.
 Carlson, Albert E. Melton, Stephen A.
 Carmouche, Joseph M. Mennella, Kenneth R.
 Carroll, Bartlett J., Jr. Mensch, Raymond G.
 Charles, Doran W. Miles, Wilson D.
 Cheal, Arnold E. Miller, James W.
 Church, Billy R. Mooney, David J.
 Colavita, Henry J., Jr. Morris, Charles T.
 Coley, John H., III Mowery, Ralph B.
 Cook, Alan W. Mulcahy, Charles J.
 Cook, John R. Mullen, William A., Jr.
 Cory, Mark E., III Mulvihill, Lee P.
 Crouch, William W. Neil, Donald L.
 Curtis, Wayne C. Ogasaware, Roy M.
 Cutler, Richard A. Onufer, Barry R.
 Dansby, James C. Pancoast, Henry M.
 Davidson, Joe W. Parks, Robert R.
 Diehl, Richard P. Partridge, Peter E.
 DiFranco, Salvatore J. Pendleton, Richard F.
 Domingos, Manuel P., Pettyjohn, Charles S.
 III Phillips, Jeffrey T.
 Draughn, James B., Phillips, Keith J.
 Pohlman, Dolphyh O., Jr.
 Dunn, Thomas P. Powers, Jerry H.
 Eaglin, Fulton B. Quinones, Joseph M.
 Ecclestone, John S., II Ragsdale, Jack D., Jr.
 Elliott, Dick D., Jr. Reed, Charles W., Jr.
 Eingle, Benjamin J. Reed, Donald J.
 Falkenrath, James H. Reed, George B., Jr.
 Feliciano, Jose R. Renwick, Harold M., Jr.
 Freck, William B. Glover, Alan F.
 Goldstein, Ronald J. Reynolds, Howard I.
 Grady, Bernard E. Reynolds, Irvin H.
 Graham, Bobby L. Rhodes, Dennis D.
 Graham, John F., Jr. Robinson, Paul J.
 Graham, Thomas Rochon, Everette C.
 A., III Rogers, Don E.
 Graves, Billy D. Rush, Wayne A.
 Gunn, Walter E. Sadler, Orin W., IV
 Haines, John L., Jr. Sarrant, Robert R.
 Hannah, Douglas W. Scott, William A.
 Hansard, James B. Sedlock, Michael E.
 Harrell, George L., II Shell, William L.
 Hart, Stacy L. Sivells, James B.
 Hartjen, Raymond C., Skilton, Robert H., III
 Jr. Smith, Nathaniel E.
 Haught, Jacob R. Smith, Vernon L.
 Hawken, Harvey H. Sollinger, Jerry M.
 Haywood, Charles E. Sowers, Errol G.
 Higgins, James E. Stallwitz, John F.
 Hinshaw, William L., II Steadman, Robert P.
 Hoefer, George M., Jr. Stemler, Orrin A.
 Hohers, Melvin A. Stiner, Tommy C.
 House, Ronald L. Stotski, Chester J.
 Hudson, McKinley Streetmaker, John I.
 Hughes, Joe H., Jr. Strenn, Carl L.
 Hurst, Bobby R. Sullivan, Bloomer D.
 Jones, Tommy M. Swan, Alfred W., Jr.
 Jung, Leon Tagliaferi, Frederick L.
 Justis, James C. Tanis, Glenn R.
 Kayes, Joseph E. Thomson, Richard W.
 Kennard, Robert B. Tilson, James G.
 Kidd, John C., II Tyner, Harris W.
 Kieft, Lewis D. Vaughn, Robert H.
 Kitchens, Larry J. Vesey, Joseph T.
 Kopcsak, Arpad A., Jr. Walker, John J.
 La Greca, John S. Walter, David P.
 Langston, Jerry W. Ward, Richard F.
 Leavitt, Thomas P. Watson, Jerry L.
 Ledbetter, Charles T. Way, David E.
 Litton, James L. Whiting, William B.
 Logan, Lamar B. Wilkinson, John H.
 Lollar, Howard W., Jr. Williams, Freddie W.
 Long, George L. Williams, Robert G.
 Long, John A. Williams, William J.
 Long, Wendel L. Willman, Landon P.
 Lowrie, Michael A. M. Wilson, Virgil L.
 Lupardus, Carl R. Winder, Gordon L.
 Mathewes, Paul H., Jr. Wishowski, Thomas M.
 Maylie, Joseph W. Wood, Blair C., Jr.
 McDonald, Benjamin H., Jr. Yearout, Paul H.
 McLain, Paul X. Zalaha, John W.
 Zimmerman, James E.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieu-

tenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:

Adams, Jack E. Cowgill, Parker J.
 Adams, Peter D. Crumpler, William B.
 Alakulppi, Vesa J. Cummings, Frederick B.
 Alexander, William H. Cunningham, Alden M.
 Alger, Terrence F. Davis, Lawrence D., Jr.
 Allen, Jonathan W. Daniels, James E.
 Allen, Michael B. Davenport, George W., Jr.
 Almaguer, Joseph A. De Maret, Will E.
 Andersen, Jerome R. Curtis, Charles C.
 Anderson, Lawrence Dalia, Jeffrey L.
 Arbogast, Cordon W. Davis, Jack S., Jr.
 Armogida, James A. De Maret, Dennis A.
 Armstrong, Donald G. Davidson, Sam R.
 Asbury, Lloyd T. Davis, Robert J.
 Bagby, Durwood R. De Graff, George C., Jr.
 Ballard, Clark T., Jr. De Maret, Will E.
 Banks, Edgar, Jr. De Smet, Dennis A.
 Barron, Max R. De Wire, James E.
 Barry, Michael J. Demchuk, Daniel
 Bassett, Byron E. Dickey, James S.
 Baucum, William N. Dickson, Harry R.
 Beach, Karl L. Doherty, James E., III
 Beatty, Norman E. Dolighan, Thomas A.
 Bell, John P. Donovan, Robert E.
 Bentson, Peter M. Dorland, John H.
 Bentz, George H. E. Douglas, Fred R., Jr.
 Best, Stephen J. Dowling, Dean E.
 Betaque, Norman Jr. Downey, Walter D., Jr.
 Blackgrove, Joseph F., Drain, Robert W.
 IV Drews, Ralph M.
 Blackwell, Eugene B., Drewry, Arthur C., Jr.
 Jr. Dunn, John A.
 Blackwell, James L., Dusenbury, Donald S.
 Jr. Dwyer, John A.
 Boehlike, Robert J. Dwyer, John R., Jr.
 Boice, William M. Earnest, Olen L.
 Bollinger, Eugene R., Eberts, Miles M.
 Jr. Eckert, Richard E.
 Bosma, Phillip H. Ehrenberg, Rudolph, H., Jr.
 Bowes, Robert S., III Ellerson, Geoffrey D., Jr.
 Boyle, Michael J. Ellerson, John C.
 Brendle, Thomas M. Ellis, Bruce H., Jr.
 Brennan, Thomas R. Embree, Howard D.
 Brightman, Austin C. Emerick, Michael L.
 Jr. Ellerson, John C.
 Britten, Lawrence A. Ellis, Bruce H., Jr.
 Brown, Noel A. Entlich, Richard E.
 Brown, Ralph P. Esposito, Curtis V.
 Brown, Robert E., Jr. Fairbanks, Leigh C., III
 Brown, William R., Jr. Brownback, Paul T.
 Brownback, Paul T. Bruce, Robert
 Farris, Ivan R.
 Buchheim, Steven O. Fletter, Wolfgang A.
 Buckley, Peter J. Foley, Robert F.
 Byrne, Donald G. Folsom, Spencer A., Jr.
 Byrnes, John W. Ford, John N.
 Caldwell, Harold E. Forsythe, Thomas K.
 Capps, Larry R. Fuller, George D.
 Cargile, Eugene D. Gallagher, Thomas F.
 Carney, Thomas P. Carns, Edwin H. J., Jr.
 Galla, Richard C.
 Galle, Joe F.
 Gantzler, Fred E., Jr.
 Chapman, Alan A. Garvey, Dale M., Jr.
 Chase, Jack S. Genetti, Albert J., Jr.
 Chickedantz, Carl E. George, William H., Jr.
 Childers, Stephen A. Gibbs, Frank C., III
 Chrisman, Ronald G. Gideon, Wendell R.
 Christensen, Allen R. Gilbert, Michael V.
 Clark, Allen B., Jr. Gladfelter, Douglas M.
 Clark, William N. Goldsmith, Richard H.
 Clay, Michael A. Goodnow, Walter L., Jr.
 Clinton, Roy J. Goorley, John T.
 Coe, Gary Q. Goth, Stephen C.
 Cole, David L. Gotheau, Andrew F.
 Cole, Richard B. Grabner, William J.
 Coleman, Donald H. Graham, Kenneth R., Jr.
 Conlon, Arthur F. Green, James A., III
 Conrad, Donald H. Gregorczyk, Leonard C.
 Cook, Lyndel L. Cornfoot, James L.
 Cooke, William J., Jr. Greybeck, Edward M.
 Coomer, William O. Coulson, Robert T., Jr.
 Conlon, Arthur F. Griffin, Donald K.
 Counts, John E. Griffin, Thomas H.

Griffith, Paul D. Mari, Louis A.
 Griffith, Thomas R. Marrow, Alvin J.
 Grogan, Timothy J. Marrs, Glenn R.
 Grolemund, William J. Matarangio, Francis T.
 Guilhaus, Howard H. Matteson, Richard J.
 Guthrie, Richard P. Maxwell, Paul F.
 Hable, Paul R., Jr. Mayer, Haldane R.
 Haines, Palmer S. McCabe, Robert L.
 Halgus, Joseph D. McCarver, James M.
 Hall, Francis G., Jr. McClatchey, Jay J.
 Hall, Garrett S. McCord, Burton K.
 Hall, Peter M. McCormack, Michael S.
 Hamilton, George T. McCrary, Wiley W.
 Handcox, Robert C. McGarity, Robert L., Jr.
 Hannigan, James R. McIntyre, Michael J.
 Hanson, Russell V., Jr. McKinnon, Richard A.
 Harman, Thomas E. McNeill, Robert H., II
 Harrington, John M. McQuary, Ray J.
 Harrison, Jerry C. Means, Dale F.
 Hartman, Charles D., III Medlin, Laurence R.
 Hawkins, William C. Meier, Arthur C., II
 Heiden, Heidi B. Malanson, Ronald A.
 Heim, Bruce K. Mercer, Carl W.
 Henderson, Frederick H. Merrill, Robert K.
 Henning, Paul H., III Merritt, William P.
 Hewette, James B., Jr. Metzger, Robert S., Jr.
 Higgins, Richard G. Miller, Bruce F.
 Hill, Edward F. Miller, George M., Jr.
 Hingston, William E., Jr. Miller, Michael D.
 Hogg, Charles C., II Millerille, William M.
 Holland, Homer J. Mitchell, Kenny D.
 Hollander, Kenneth N. Mitchell, Ralph M., II
 Holterman, Gordon C. Mock, Phillip W.
 Hotman, Clyde W., Jr. Moose, Raymond R.
 Hudson, Roland B., III Morehead, Wayne E.
 Hughes, James S. Morgan, John F.
 Hustead, Stephen C. Morris, Henry
 Ingram, Lionel R., Jr. Moses, George L.
 Ischinger, Martin M. Mosier, Douglas K.
 Jackson, David S. Murff, James D.
 James, Richard D. Murphy, Dennis C.
 Janof, Lawrence S. Myers, Douglas V.
 Jaworowski, Joseph J. Myers, Duane H.
 Nahlik, Charles V.
 Jenison, Raymond L. Nakashima, Gerald N.
 Jenkins, Michael M. Nativig, Cliff M., Jr.
 Johnson, Douglas V., II Nelander, James C.
 Johnston, Reynold A. Nelson, Harold W.
 Jones, Alan F. Nicholas, Walter D.
 Jones, Bradley K. Nolan, James T.
 Jones, James A., Jr. O'Connor, James M.
 Karoly, Frank J. O'Donnell, John R.
 Karr, Thomas W. O'Sullivan, Kenneth E.
 Kauz, John J., Jr. O'Toole, Robert H.
 Keaveney, Michael W. Odland, Robert O.
 Kelley, William T. Oliver, John F., III
 Kelly, Colin P., III Olsen, Alexander K.
 Kelly, Peter A. Orlicki, George A.
 Kelly, Peter M., III Orndorf, Harvey W.
 Kelly, Thomas J. Otis, Malcolm D.
 Keteltas, Gilbert C. Owen, William J.
 Kilroy, Michael W. Palmer, Robert C.
 Kingry, Roy L., Jr. Pappas, George
 Kinsey, Charles H., Jr. Parker, John E.
 Knowlton, David W., III Patten, Lynne M.
 Kosevich, Richard S. Perry, George E., III
 Kunzig, Louis A., III Pieron, Rex F.
 La Fond, Clovis O. Fogorzelski, Jerome A.
 Lang, Stephen A. Popielarski, Stephen J., Jr.
 Lawn, Michael J., Jr. Porper, Henry H., Jr.
 Leach, Dennis A. Prutow, Dennis J.
 Lee, Edward M., Jr. Quinlan, Michael M.
 Lengyel, Joseph W., Jr. Rasmussen, Ralph J.
 Lennon, Francis L. Reh, Paul A., Jr.
 Lewis, Arthur C. Reilly, Iain
 Lewsen, Robert F. Reinholtz, Richard K.
 Little, David R. Rice, Lewis A.
 Little, William W. Riceman, John P.
 Loden, George I. P. Robbins, John R., II
 Lujan, Armando Robbins, William Y.
 Lundin, Jon E. Robert, Emile A., Jr.
 Lutz, Ward A. Roberts, James F., Jr.
 Lutz, William G. Roberts, Richard H.
 Mabardy, David M. Robertson, Joe B.
 Mallison, Thomas C. Robey, Lyle G.
 Manning, Roger D. Robinson, William A.
 Marchand, Gary J. Roife, Charles O., Jr.

Roth, John C. C. Summers, Michael H.
 Rowan, Edmond M., Jr. Sutton, Paul D.
 Russell, Thomas A. Swisher, Arthur H.
 Ruth, James M., Jr. Tallie, Dennis K.
 Ryan, Arthur J., III Tate, Christopher P.
 Sage, Terence F. Tezak, Edward G.
 Sallee, David K. Thompson, Leon G.
 Sanchez, Luis T., Jr. Thompson, Tommy R.
 Sarn, James E. Thomson, Alexander
 Sartor, William M., Jr. J.
 Sauser, Robert G. Trucks, Robert C.
 Sawin, Peter L. Turpin, William C.
 Scharf, Richard D. Tyler, Tyron S.
 Schaum, Fred W. Vanneman, Robert G.
 Scheidig, Robert E. Varnell, Allan K.
 Scherrer, George M., Jr. Vaughan, Curry N., Jr.
 Schmidt, Charles L., Jr. Vaughn, Tom J., Jr.
 Schott, Charles R. Venes, Richard A.
 Schwartz, Karl O. Virant, Leo B., II
 Scott, Alan H. Vogel, Robert A.
 Seidel, Andrew B. Vopatek, Michael J.
 Seiwert, Anthony J., Jr. Voss, Didrik A.
 Senecal, Jan L. Vote, Gary F.
 Shepard, John T. Walker, John S., Jr.
 Shine, Alexander P. Walker, Ralph B., III
 Shotwell, James H. Wall, Kenneth E., Jr.
 Siebenaler, Donald L. Wall, Sandy K.
 Silberstein, Kenneth R. Waller, John S.
 Sill, Louis F., Jr. Walsh, Michael E.
 Silvay, Stephen, Jr. Walsh, Richard R.
 Silvay, William J. Wangsgard, Chris P.
 Simmons, Michael D., III L.
 Simonetta, Russell S., Jr. Warder, Hiram W., II
 Sloane, Donald L. Weber, Richard E., III
 Smith, Donald J. Westbrook, Joseph A.
 Smith, Emmette W. Westermeier, John T., Jr.
 Smith, Glenn N. White, Charles T., Jr.
 Smith, Patrick R. Whitehead, William J.
 Smith, Roger M. Solenberger, Thomas M.
 Smith, William D., Jr. Wildrick, Edward W., III
 Stahl, Steven P. Williams, Douglas T.
 Stanley, Paul D. Willson, Daniel A.
 Steele, Robert M. Wilson, John W., III
 Steinig, Ronald D. Wilson, Norton B., Jr.
 Stennis, William H. Wilson, Richard A.
 Stevens, Pat M., IV Wilson, Thomas A., II
 Stewart, Charles W., Jr. Wilson, William L.
 Stidham, Robert J. Winters, Robert F.
 Stonehouse, Gerald F. Witt, William W.
 Stribling, Roger W., Jr. Wolz, Donald J.
 Young, Richard G., Jr. Wood, Robert H.
 Stribling, Roger W., Jr. Woods, John M., Jr.
 Struble, Daniel O. Woods, Luther L.
 Stryker, James W. Wyrwas, John A.
 Sturbois, Louis J., III Yamashita, Ted K.
 Zelley, Robert A. Yanagihara, Galen H.
 Brady, Edward C. Young, Richard G., Jr.
 Eckland, James D. Young, Timothy R.
 Eichorst, Bradley D. Zelley, Robert A.
 Farrington, Reed M. Polonis, Lawrence L.
 Gowens, John W., II Potter, Jerome W.
 Hecht, Robert G. Prangley, Robert E.
 Jacoby, Stephen A. Reid, Tilden R.
 McCracken, Robert E. Sim, Alan R.
 McClaury, Jeffrey B. Smart, Neil A.
 Mullen, George M. Thorlin, Philip S.
 Wall, John C. Yeager, Frederick J.

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Air Force Academy, 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 541, 3284, and 3287:

tenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284, and 3287:

Wilson, Joe H. R.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Dr. Arthur Lee Kinsolving, St. James' Episcopal Church, New York City, offered the following prayer:

Lord of all, whose balance trieth the nations to lift up or to cast down, we bless Thee for the great heritage of freedom and of faith conveyed to us by the courage, dedication, and sacrifice of unnumbered predecessors.

We implore anew Thy continuing grace and guidance to all who are charged with important trusts of leadership in this era of critical issues and anxious circumstances.

In giving Americans the spirit to claim their rights Thou hast called them to the dignity of accepting their obligations. Believing that the sovereignty of this people derives from Thee, may we exercise it, not only in obedience to the laws which we enact but to Thy moral law. Grant to us each today absolute loyalty to the absolute end and wisdom to discern the measure of our loyalty to all relative ends.

We entrust to Thee again our Nation and our hopes for the fulfillment of Thy will among all nations upon earth and for the realization of the great peace. And not unto us but unto Thee, O God, be the glory from generation to generation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 2, 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 762. An act to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tule Lake area of California.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963—H.R. 5517.

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

There was no objection.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my

remarks, and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members who may so desire may extend their remarks on the subject of my speech.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay deep and abiding respect to a great American who, incidentally, is a New Yorker, and perhaps more importantly, coincidentally, is a great Brooklynite, for on this day, 75 years ago, there was born in Brooklyn a man who has been among us for many, many distinguished years and who now is the great chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Representative EMANUEL CELLER.

His many monuments are enshrined permanently in the statute books of this country. His memory will long remain among us who have been privileged to serve him. I commend him, Mr. Speaker, today on this great occasion. I extend to him my warm and respectful regards and I expressly wish, in which I am sure I am joined by all his colleagues, that he will be among us for many, many fruitful years and will enjoy the loving and devoted companionship of his charming and beautiful wife and family for a great many, many more years.

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

Mr. KEOGH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the distinguished gentleman from New York has taken this time for this purpose. I desire to associate myself with his remarks. I join him in wishing MANNY CELLER many happy returns of the day and many, many more years of the brilliant and useful service which have characterized his tenure in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEOGH. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. KEOGH. I will be delighted to yield to the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York and the distinguished majority leader. The great chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has distinguished himself over the years. He is not only chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, but he has a judicial temperament, and as a result of that he is admired and respected by every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KEOGH. With all the gentleman from Louisiana has said I am in complete agreement. I wish I could have said it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], in saluting the respected dean of the New York delegation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], on the occasion of his 75th birthday.

During the 40 years that MANNY CELLER has been a Member of this body, he has been an outstanding leader and one of the great legislators of our time. He is and always has been a foe of injustice, a champion of the people, with a genuine love for his fellow man. I am indeed fortunate to have him as a personal friend. On this occasion, MANNY CELLER has my congratulations on his birthday and my best wishes for many, many more years of good health, great happiness with his lovely wife and family and blessings so well earned.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for directing attention to the birthday of our great chairman. He has served in Congress well for many years. His kindness and ability to understand problems make him an unusual and outstanding American. It is my hope that he will serve for many years in the future—happy birthday, MANNY."

Mr. KEOGH. I appreciate very much what the gentleman from Colorado has said.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect some would have hoped that this privilege would have been extended to that great Committee on the Judiciary, but I do remind the membership that we from Brooklyn are a provincial lot.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. KEOGH], in his remarks about our distinguished colleague on the anniversary of his 75th birthday, MANNY CELLER of Brooklyn. I have known MANNY CELLER for at least 35 years and more. Despite the fact that we may not always agree politically, I think he is one of the finest men I have known. I consider him one of my best friends. I hope that he lives many more years to serve his constituents in this House.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, permit me to thank the gentleman from New York and to say to him that his contribution obviously adds great depth to this tribute.

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

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 5th year I have had the privilege to serve on the minority side of the Committee on the Judiciary. I should like to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York, in paying tribute to the chairman of that great committee on this happy occasion. Our senior colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER] has served that committee, the Congress and the Nation with distinction over the years. It is a great privilege for those of us on the minority side of the House Committee

on the Judiciary to serve with him under his leadership.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York adding to this tribute, and I would only say, I hope he has the great and good fortune for many years to come to serve on the same committee and under the same chairman.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today is the 75th birthday of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. For more than half his lifetime, MANNY CELLER has served his constituents, his State, and his country in the House of Representatives. MANNY CELLER came to Congress in March of 1923 and uninterruptedly, for over 40 years, has engaged in every major issue that has come before this body. The marvel of his energy, his grasp of all the intricate problems Congress has had to cope with, together with his kindness and his unlimited patience, have been admitted by all who have had the privilege to serve with him. He has never abused the special privileges that come with senior service nor the power that comes with chairmanship.

I have never known MANNY CELLER to give up a good fight. In antitrust legislation, in immigration, in civil rights, he stands among the foremost in his knowledge and understanding of the subjects and in his persistent pursuit of legislative achievement.

I know of few men who are as free from rancor as is MANNY. The members of his committee have told me how much free give and take there is in discussion and how much he has achieved as a political realist.

Congress after Congress MANNY has been reelected by increasing majorities and there are few, indeed, who can equal his record in the ability to receive among the highest plurality election returns for membership in the House.

I am happy to join my colleagues in wishing him well and in expressing the hope that he will be with us for many, many years to come for there is no doubt that we appreciate him in the same fashion as his constituents do—for his integrity, his intelligence and his humanitarianism.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER is a great American, an outstanding legislator, honorable and trustworthy in every respect. On this, his birthday anniversary, I extend to him my hearty congratulations and my very best wishes for countless of similar anniversaries.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in wishing our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER] a happy birthday. I have greatly enjoyed our friendship over the years. It gives me great pleasure to extend my personal greetings and best wishes on this happy occasion. I wish him many more of these anniversaries, and much happiness for many years to come.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other Members in recognition

of the birthday of the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. I have the good fortune to be a member of the House Judiciary Committee and also a member of Subcommittee No. 5 which is the so-called blue ribbon Celler subcommittee. For the past 5 years I served on this subcommittee and had a chance to work closely with the distinguished chairman and observe his manner, attitude, philosophy, patience, and temperament. I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that he is the most remarkable chairman under whom I have served in two legislative bodies in the past 13 years. He is very able, very persistent, very tolerant, very learned and is undoubtedly one of the best legislators that I have ever met.

I believe that he has contributed considerably to the high reputation which the House Judiciary Committee enjoys. His fairness to all members, his consideration of all positions, his calmness and diplomacy make him well respected and admired by all members of the committee, the House of Representatives, the Congress of the United States and the people of our country.

I salute the chairman on his 75th birthday and I hope that he enjoys many more birthdays as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the "Legal Sage" of Brooklyn, our colleague EMANUEL CELLER, has reached his 75th birthday. We greet the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee with admiration and respect. As an authority in legalistic doctrines, he has been the sponsor of hundreds of laws throughout his 19 terms in the Congress of the United States, 1923-64. He personifies in character and intellectual attainment the true advocate. He is practical in his approach to legal problems and thoroughly prepared to sustain his legalistic concepts with facts sustaining his analysis of each principle involved. MANNY CELLER is loved and respected by the members of his committee. He is understanding and considerate of other people's feelings and attitudes in debate, but in his analytical mental determination he is cold in his reasoning and direct in his attack. MANNY is a true and loyal friend.

In the history of the Congress the measure of his work will undoubtedly reflect the high purposes of his legislation in all fields and the importance of these laws to insure a free society as well as a free economy.

May God bless him and his family for many years to come to so continue his great work dedicated to the people of a grateful Republic.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since 1922 this House has been graced with the presence of our dear friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. Today it is my distinct pleasure to join with our colleagues in honoring a man who has served with and guided us for so many fruitful years of service.

MANNY CELLER has actively participated in public life since the First World

War; he has been chairman of our Judiciary Committee continuously since 1949 with the exception of the 83d Congress when the other party won control of the House; he has served with distinction as the chairman of that committee and much of the enlightened legislation adopted in the last decade is attributable to his leadership.

All of Brooklyn, as well as the city and State of New York, have gloried in the honor he has brought to us in serving his city, State, and Nation in every worthwhile activity. He is truly a great scholar and a fine gentleman.

Today is his 75th birthday. I am happy to extend to him the traditional Hebrew wish that he be with us "until 120."

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 75th birthday of the venerable, vigorous and astute chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. It gives me great pleasure and satisfaction to be able to join with my colleagues in saluting him.

His life is truly a Horatio Alger story. Born in poverty yet by dint of his personal drive and ambition, he rose to become one of the most knowledgeable and respected Members of Congress.

It is my fond hope that this House shall be graced for many years with his presence and that we may have the benefit of his advice, of his experience, his knowledge, and his intelligence to help guide us in directing the affairs of this Nation.

I know of no one who is more representative of those ideals which constitute a true American.

It has indeed been a privilege to have served with him in this august body.

I wish him and his family continued happiness and long life.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a child was born in the city of Brooklyn on May 6, 1888. Few people realized at that time that he would be, on his 75th birthday, the dean of the New York congressional delegation. I refer to the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, a man who has served his city, State, and Nation with honor.

EMANUEL CELLER, our colleague in the House of Representatives, attended the public schools and the public high schools of the city of New York. He was graduated from Columbia College and in 1912 from Columbia Law School. He practiced law for about 10 years, and then was elected to the 68th Congress in 1922. He has served in this body in all succeeding Congresses. There is one man in the House of Representatives who has served longer than he, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

It has been an honor for me to know and to serve as a colleague in the House of Representatives with EMANUEL CELLER. In that period of time I have developed a deep respect for him as a colleague and as a personal friend. His integrity, his ability, and his wit have added much to the deliberations of the House of Representatives.

During his 40 years of service, EMANUEL CELLER has sponsored and had enacted into law more than 100 bills. He has been a leader in the fight for civil rights

and he has shown courage in his fight in the antimonopoly field. He is presently the chairman of that important Committee on Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The fact that the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER has been returned to the House of Representatives for these many years shows the high esteem in which he is held by his constituents and by those who know him.

On this occasion of EMANUEL CELLER's 75th birthday, I wish him the best of health and God's blessings for the remainder of his years.

ADDITIONAL 2,000 MILES OF INTER-STATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would authorize the designation of an additional 2,000 miles for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. This increased mileage would be located in those areas designated as redevelopment areas by the Secretary of Commerce under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The benefits of my bill would be two-fold. First, the construction of this additional mileage on projects of the magnitude of Interstate System highway would immediately help those areas suffering from chronic unemployment, and second, many economic and other permanent benefits would result from these highway transportation improvements.

I am convinced that a major factor in causing an area to be economically depressed is inaccessibility in the case of rural areas, and inefficient existing highway systems in the case of urban areas. A pleasant and trouble-free route of travel is essential to the tourist business, and transportation costs are major elements to be considered by a manufacturer or merchant seeking a suitable location for his plant.

This bill, of course, could benefit the Allegheny Highlands area, which is particularly deserving of special attention. However, the application of this bill would be fully nationwide in scope, and would assist every part of the country wherein economic recovery is being hindered by the lack of a first rate highway system.

CRIME IN WASHINGTON

Mr. BECKER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I called the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there seems to be a blackout on crime news

in the newspapers of the District of Columbia. I know that Members have been reading the news avidly and agree with me now that there seems to be a complete blackout with respect to crime in the District of Columbia.

I know there is crime going on and so do you know it. I am informed by an official source, since I made that statement, that crime statistics in the District for the month of April are going to show a decrease. I am sure we will all be happy to hear that. But I am wondering if the decrease ought to be predicated on the enforcement of a rule that went into effect against investigative arrests in the District of Columbia, and whether it is going to be a statistical decrease in crime caused by the fact that the police are prevented from doing the job they are capable of doing.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that crime is decreasing, but it is unfortunate for the thousands of visitors who come to Washington and feel they can walk the streets freely and go about their business, as they rightfully should, without any warning as to what is transpiring here in the District.

I have asked the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate what is causing this complete blackout of the news respecting crime in the District of Columbia, and I would hope we will get some information on that subject.

SECRETARY FREEMAN NOT RELIABLE SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I urged the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to get the facts straight before giving the feed grains program a new 2-year lease on life. My experience indicates that Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman is not a reliable source of information. I therefore urged the committee to get professional witnesses from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to clarify what the taxpayers got for their money under the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs.

Mr. Freeman has used unrelated and inaccurate statistics. He has repeatedly exaggerated stockpile reductions and has used phony and misleading guesswork to create the illusion that the feed grain programs have cut tax costs and improved farm income. Actually, costs go up and results go down. The financial plight of the farmer is worse than when the program began.

This year we are spending about \$140 million more than last year, but getting 3 million acres less land retired.

In 3 years we have spent about \$3 billion. Despite this outlay, feed grain production this year will nearly equal the base years before the programs began.

Congress has the responsibility to taxpayers to come up with a less expensive program.

THE INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF SUGAR

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, although the Department of Agriculture reports that the U.S. wholesalers, retailers, and industrial users have taken a healthy hedge against increasing prices in sugar by buying and stockpiling since late 1962, they have not permitted the benefits of their prudence to "trickle down" to the American consumer. As a matter of fact, they have joined to participate in "bilking" the American sugar consumer.

At local retail outlets, the price of a 5-pound bag of granulated sugar has jumped from 55 cents to 66 cents within the last 10 days—a price increase of 20 percent. When this 20 percent increase is tagged onto every spoonful of sugar consumed every day by 180 million Americans, the conclusion is that someone is getting loaded on sweet profits.

There is absolutely no need for the consumer to pay a 2- to 3-cent-a-pound tribute to the sugar overlords. Under the sugar bill passed by Congress, the fancy prices are effectively pegged by the quota system. If the beneficiaries of the sugar-rigging law betray their trust to the American people by putting artificial upward pressure on prices, our Government should take prompt action to stifle profiteering by suspending the U.S. duty on sugar and making it possible for the American consumer to purchase sugar at lower world prices.

When the price of sugar leaps 20 percent within 10 days, the consumer's "peril point" has been reached and the Government should suspend its protection of the sugar "Shylocks" who are endeavoring to manipulate lush profits into their pockets.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight, May 6, to file a report on the bill H.R. 4996.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary

of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL HEALTH BENEFIT PLANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1819) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes.

Mr. MC FALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR USE OF KWAJALEIN AND DALAP ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2072) to assure payment of just compensation for the use and occupancy of certain lands on Kwajalein and Dalap Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make inquiry of a member of the committee regarding this bill. As I understand it, Mr. ASPINALL is the author of the bill. Could the gentleman tell me whether or not there is any possibility that these claims will exceed the \$1 million prohibition under our rules? I notice the report says it will amount to at least \$600,000, but these are not all of the claims that are possible for presentation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is our understanding that the appropriation available will be adequate to cover any claims that might arise, and that a number of these claims will be adjudicated by the Court of Claims. This is sort of a second string of the ball proposition.

Mr. HARSHA. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person from whom the United States, on or before April 1, 1946, took rights of possession, use, occupancy, or usufruct of lands on Kwajalein Atoll or Dalap Island within the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to which he or his predecessor in interest was entitled under the traditions and customs of the Marshallese people and to whom or whose representative compensation in full satisfaction for all of his claims against the United States and the government of said trust territory arising out of said taking has not been paid may, within one year from the date of this Act, file a petition for the determination by the United States Court of Claims of his claim for just compensation. Upon the timely filing of such petition the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the value of the rights taken in the same manner and under the same rules as any other cause before it, or as near thereto as is feasible in the circumstances, and in the light of such principles of equity, justice, and fair dealing as are pertinent to the cause. Any such claim may be heard and determined notwithstanding laches or the expiration of any period of limitations which would be applicable thereto in the absence of this Act. The judgment of the Court of Claims may provide for payment of a lump sum for the possession, use, and occupancy (including indefinite possession, use, and occupancy) by the United States and the government of the trust territory of the lands subject thereto and/or for the payment of an annual sum for such possession, use, and occupancy, but shall not include compensation for any period prior to that date during or after World War II on which the island where the land in question is located was finally determined by competent military authority to be secure. If the judgment includes provision for payment of an annual sum, the court shall retain jurisdiction of the cause and may, on motion of either party, redetermine the amount thereafter payable from time to time, but no such redetermination shall be sought or made more often than once every ten years. Any judgment of the Court of Claims shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2517, and of section 1302 of the Act of July 27, 1956 (70 Stat. 694), as amended (31 U.S.C. 724a). The payment of any claim, after its determination in accordance with this section, shall be a full discharge of the United States and the government of the trust territory of all claims and demands touching any of the matters involved in the controversy. No claim which could be prosecuted as hereinbefore provided but is not so prosecuted may thereafter be entertained by any court of the United States or the trust territory or, except as provided in section 6 of this Act, by any administrative agency thereof.

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to assure every person who or whose representative has not been compensated for deprivation of rights of possession, use, occupancy, or usufruct, as described in section 1 of this Act, of an opportunity to have his claim judicially determined. To this end, the interests of any such person who is not himself a party to a suit instituted under this Act shall be represented by the persons named in Marshall Islands Congress Resolution Numbered 16 of 1956. Any dispute with respect to distribution of sums paid to parties

under any judgment in their favor or under any compromise settlement made as provided in section 4 of this Act which cannot be resolved otherwise than by litigation shall be determined by the courts of the trust territory in accordance with the laws of the trust territory and the traditions and customs of the Marshallese people.

SEC. 3. Any judge or commissioner of the Court of Claims may, for the purposes of this Act, sit at a convenient place or places in the United States or the trust territory to take evidence. Subpenas issued out of said court upon persons residing in the trust territory shall be served by the sheriff of the Marshall Islands district or his deputy, and a failure to comply therewith shall be punishable by the High Court of the Trust Territory in accordance with the laws thereof in the same manner as if said subpena had issued out of said high court. The government of the trust territory shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed an agency of the United States within the purview of section 2507 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General of the United States or his assistant shall represent the United States and the government of the trust territory in all cases arising under this Act and may call upon the attorney general of the trust territory for such assistance as he is able to render, and shall have authority, with the approval of the Court of Claims, to compromise any such case. Any such compromise settlement shall be reported to the Congress by the Attorney General, stating the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, and the amount awarded.

SEC. 5. The fees of any attorney or attorneys representing Marshallese claimants in any action brought pursuant to this Act shall be fixed by the Court of Claims at such amount as the court, in accordance with standards obtaining for prosecuting similar contingent claims, finds to be adequate compensation for services rendered and results obtained, plus reasonable expenses incurred in the prosecution of the claim.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to forbid the payment by the high commissioner of the trust territory from funds heretofore appropriated and made available for this purpose of approximately \$500 per acre in full satisfaction of all claims relating to any specified tract of land or not more than \$250 per acre in partial satisfaction of such claims, but neither the appropriation and availability of the first of said amounts nor any other offer by an officer of the United States or of the government of the trust territory shall be construed as an admission by the United States or the government of the trust territory that the same is the value of the rights of possession, use, occupancy, and usufruct taken or be admitted as evidence to prove the same. Any claimant by whom or on whose behalf suit could be but is not instituted within one year, as provided in this Act, shall thereafter be paid a proper portion of such appropriated funds and such payment shall constitute full satisfaction of all of his claims and demands with respect to the land to which it pertains.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2073) to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) whatever right, title, or interest the United States has in lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coastlines of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, as heretofore or hereafter modified by accretion, erosion, and reliction, including filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which were formerly, permanently, or periodically covered by tidal waters is hereby conveyed to the government of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, as the case may be, to be administered in trust for the benefit of the people thereof.

(b) There are excepted from the transfer made by subsection (a) hereof—

(i) all deposits of oil, gas, and other minerals, but the term "minerals" shall not include sand and gravel;

(ii) all lands adjacent to property owned by the United States above the line of mean high tide;

(iii) all lands acquired by the United States by eminent domain proceedings, purchase, exchange, or gift;

(iv) all lands filled in, built up, or otherwise reclaimed by the United States for its own use;

(v) all lands containing structures and improvements constructed by the United States;

(vi) all lands that have heretofore been determined by the President or the Congress to be of such scientific, scenic, or historic character as to warrant preservation and administration under the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented; and

(vii) all lands designated by the President within one hundred twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act:

Provided, That upon request of the Governor of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, the President may, without reimbursement or with such reimbursement as he may deem appropriate, convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in any of the lands described in subparagraphs (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), and (vii) of this subsection to the government of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, as the case may be, if such land is no longer needed by the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of the President to establish naval defensive sea areas and naval airspace reservations around and over the island of Guam when deemed necessary for national defense.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of the lands transferred by section 1 hereof, and the navigable waters overlying such lands, for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

(c) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of the lands conveyed by section 1 hereof, and the navigable waters overlying such lands, for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and develop-

ment of the lands and natural resources which are specifically conveyed to the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, as the case may be, by section 1 of this Act.

Sec. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, as the case may be, shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over parties found, acts performed, and offenses committed on property owned, reserved, or controlled by the United States in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa shall be a bar to any prosecution under the criminal laws of the United States for the same act or acts, and a judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of the United States shall be a bar to any prosecution under the laws of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa for the same act or acts.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the President may from time to time exclude from the concurrent jurisdiction of the government of Guam persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed on the property of the United States which is under the control of the Secretary of Defense to such extent and in such circumstances as he finds required in the interest of the national defense.

(c) The government of Guam shall exercise its concurrent jurisdiction over persons to whom the Uniform Code of Military Justice is applicable subject to such limitations thereon as may be agreed to by the Governor of Guam and the Secretary of Defense.

Sec. 4. Subsection (b) of section 31 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 510), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) All right, title, and interest of the United States in the property placed under the control of the government of the Virgin Islands by section 4 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1807, 1808), is hereby conveyed to such government: *Provided*, That with respect to lands and other properties which on the date of this Act are designated pursuant to law for administration by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, such lands and properties shall retain the legal status accorded them immediately prior to the enactment of this Act."

Sec. 5. Subsection (b) of section 28 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 392) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) All other property, real and personal, owned by the United States in Guam, not reserved by the President of the United States within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, is hereby conveyed to the government of Guam, to be administered for the benefit of the people of Guam, and the legislature shall have authority, subject to such limitations as may be imposed upon its acts by this Act or subsequent Acts of the Congress, to legislate with respect to such property, real and personal, in such manner as it may deem desirable."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "including filled-in, made," and insert "artificially made, filled-in".

Page 2, line 16 and 17, strike out all of paragraph (v) and insert the following:

(v) all tracts or parcels of land containing on any part thereof any structures or improvements constructed by the United States;

Page 3, line 14, strike out "island of Guam" and insert "Islands of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands".

Page 4, line 11, after the word "resources" add "not in derogation of United States navigational servitude and rights".

Page 5, lines 12 through 16, strike out all of subsection (c).

Page 6, strike out all of lines 9 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) All other property, real and personal, owned by the United States in Guam, not reserved by the President of the United States prior to November 1, 1950, is hereby conveyed to the government of Guam, to be administered for the benefit of the people of Guam, and the legislature shall have authority, subject to such limitations as may be imposed upon its acts by this Act or subsequent Acts of the Congress, to legislate with respect to such property, real and personal, in such manner as it may deem desirable.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON THE DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1709) to establish a Federal Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island (in this Act referred to as "the Commission") which shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be appointed by the President, one by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one by the Governor of the State of California, and one by the mayor of San Francisco.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. (a) The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(b) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall make an investigation and study of possible uses for Alcatraz Island when it is no longer used as a Federal prison.

(b) The Commission shall recommend the use or uses which it regards as most appropriate, shall make an estimate of the cost thereof, and shall recommend how such cost should be borne.

Sec. 4. The Commission shall transmit the results of its investigation and study, and its recommendations, in a report to the Congress submitted not later than December 31, 1963. In the event that such report is made when the Congress is not in session, it shall be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Six months after the submission of such report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

Sec. 5. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of

the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U.S.C. 99).

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], what if any costs would be involved in the administration activities or in the study activities by this Commission?

Mr. SHELLEY. No costs whatever, are provided for in this bill. Section 5 of this measure contains the following proviso:

Members of the Commission appointed under authority of this act shall serve without compensation.

Also, there is no request contained in the bill for any money for payment of any staff whatsoever.

Mr. HARSHA. Will it be necessary to employ a staff?

Mr. SHELLEY. It should not be necessary to employ a staff. Five people will be appointed. They can hold the hearings and evaluate the suggestions that have already come in. There are various and sundry suggestions regarding the future use of Alcatraz Island, ranging all the way from a Statue of St. Francis to a suggestion that the prison should be used as a wax museum with the figures of Al Capone and some of the other notorious characters that have been incarcerated in it. May I say that I am violently against that type of use of the property.

The Commission, upon completion of its investigation and study, would make recommendations as to the proper use of the island. It is the hope of the people of San Francisco and the hope of the General Services Administration, which will have the responsibility for disposing of the island, that something of a symbolic nature in the form of a statue would be recommended after a study by the Commission.

Mr. HARSHA. As the gentleman from California points out, it is my understanding that the General Services Administration has the responsibility of disposing of Federal property and public property not otherwise retained for governmental use. Is there objection to the General Services Administration disposing of this property in its normal fashion?

Mr. SHELLEY. There is no objection whatsoever. The Federal Government at the present time retains the title to the property. Representatives of the General Services Administration testified before the committee. Mr. Bernard Boutin, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, made clear they welcome the idea of a commission which would help them come to some conclusion on a proper and beneficial use of the property. Whether it would be retained under Federal title or whether it would be transferred to the State for a historical monument use of it, or what use will be made of it.

Mr. HARSHA. I see.

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

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

MR. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be pointed out that the Island of Alcatraz unfortunately, or fortunately, belongs to practically the entire world. It sits right in our front yard. It is legally a part of the city and county of San Francisco, and of the congressional district which the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] represents. He and I and others, I am sure, are receiving literally hundreds—some sensible and some crazy—suggestions. But there is not any doubt there is going to be tremendous public interest in assuring that whatever use this property will be put to, since the Federal Government is no longer going to use it for its present purposes, is a sensible one and one that protects the public interest. For that reason we felt that a representative group of people, representing the purely public interest, ought to examine the various proposals plus the possibility that there might be some requirement in the future development of the bay area; that whatever use is made of it for the development of that area we certainly did not intend to change the usual disposal provisions that would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration—we felt that this kind of advice would be most helpful in seeing that a decent job was done.

MR. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object I wonder if we could have some idea from the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] as to what kind of monument might be erected on Alcatraz?

MR. SHELLEY. That is exactly why the commission is being proposed. Some people have written in suggesting a large statue of St. Francis, with his arms out toward the Golden Gate. Others have written in and stated that to erect a statue of St. Francis would be injecting the religious issue. Another suggestion that came to me and has been proposed to the General Services Administration is a statue of a western type male standing with a composite type of Asiatic, symbolizing the joining of East and West at the entrance to San Francisco Harbor.

The commission would have the responsibility of studying these suggestions, evaluating costs and finding the best public use that could be made of the island.

MR. GROSS. If the commission does recommend a monument, then will there be a demand on Congress asking for money to build it?

MR. SHELLEY. I am sure that the erection of such a monument would be by public subscription.

MR. GROSS. That is fine; let it be kept that way.

MR. SHELLEY. This is not the time to do that. The bill simply sets up the commission.

MR. GROSS. Let us briefly discuss the commission. I notice on page 5 of the report a letter from the Attorney General's Office which states as follows:

The granting to non-Federal officers, such as the Governor of California and the mayor of San Francisco, the power to appoint mem-

bers to a Federal body would be an undesirable departure from customary practice.

I understand that the bill has been amended to provide that the Governor of California and the mayor of San Francisco will nominate appointees to the commission which, in my opinion, is something in the nature of a subterfuge. Why did you not just go ahead and let the Governor of California and mayor of San Francisco appoint somebody instead of this "around the barn" method of nominating? The President is almost bound to take the nominations made by the Governor and the mayor, is he not? Is not this something of a precedent for the Governor and the mayor to nominate candidates to a Federal commission?

MR. SHELLEY. May I say to my friend from Iowa that he is imputing a motivation that is not here at all.

MR. GROSS. Just a minute. I do not impute anything and I do not impugn anybody.

MR. SHELLEY. The gentleman asked the question, Is not this a subterfuge? My direct answer to that is "No," it is not a subterfuge.

It is a correction very properly made by the committee. The original draft provided that one member be appointed by the Governor and one by the mayor of San Francisco because of the local interest. This is wrong; and when the committee had a hearing on it and pointed that out, based upon the objections raised by the Attorney General, both my colleague from San Francisco and I and the Administrator of General Services Administration agreed that the committee's suggestion would be more appropriate. That is, that the President shall appoint three, and that the Governor and mayor of San Francisco can nominate. There is no requirement that the President even accept those nominations.

MR. GROSS. I understand that.

MR. SHELLEY. This takes into account some of the local interests. Since the President appoints them, the responsibility is on the President, and the report will be made through the Federal machinery.

MR. GROSS. But did you get from the Justice Department a letter saying that this met their objection to the original bill?

MR. SHELLEY. At the hearing before the committee a representative of the Justice Department was present and said this removed their objection and satisfied them.

MR. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "one" and insert "three."

Page 1, line 7, after "President" insert "of the United States".

Page 1, lines 8, 9, and 10, strike "one by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one by the Governor of the State of California, and one by the mayor of San Francisco," and insert "and one by the President of the

Senate. The three members appointed by the President of the United States shall include a member nominated by the Governor of the State of California and a member nominated by the Mayor of San Francisco."

Page 2, lines 22 through 25 and page 3, lines 1 through 5, strike all of section 5 of the bill and insert a new section 5 as follows:

SEC. 5. Members of the commission appointed under the authority of this Act shall serve without compensation.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF FOR CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5042) for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

MR. PELLY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the fact that similar legislation, which would relieve certain officers of a liability, has been strenuously objected to on the Consent Calendar before because there was no indication as to who was responsible. One of our colleagues time and again has asked that this legislation specifically state who is responsible for the errors.

Likewise, I think it should be pointed out that the military often is prone to forgive officers for their errors, whereas they are not so free to relieve noncommissioned officers of their liability, and ask these latter individuals to make repayment.

Because of former objections by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], because of the failure of the committee to indicate exactly who is responsible, I intend to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice, but I will be glad to invite any comment by someone from the committee who can clear up this point.

MR. ASHMORE. I do not know about the objections in the past to this bill's being considered on the Consent Calendar. It might have been during the 1962 session, and probably was. But I should like to remind the gentleman that the matter was evidently cleared up during the past session because it passed this House during the last session of Congress. The errors of incorrect computation were made by officials in the Navy based upon records of inactive enlisted Naval Reserve service. They have recommended that the bill be brought before the House so that these things may be corrected and all of these men may be treated in the same manner.

MR. PELLY. Would the gentleman indicate as to whether the committee has interested itself in placing responsibility on the individuals who made the error? That is the point that has been raised when previous legislation of this kind has come up on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE. This legislation is an outgrowth of this situation that existed for some 15 years. It has come about due to the fact that the Comptroller General made his ruling in 1961 which placed these men in this position. The longevity payments involved were made over a 15-year period on the basis of Navy records of enlisted inactive reserve service which was, in effect, deleted in 1961, when this ruling was made by the Comptroller General.

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

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. Without regard to this specific legislation, early last year I tried to point out on several occasions to the House that more and more bills were coming in, claims bills, to compensate people and forgive payments because of errors that had been made. I am sure that is what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is referring to; the overall situation with regard to claims bills.

Last year I urged the committees handling these bills to point out those responsible for the increasing number of errors. The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Campbell, in testifying before our committee the other day cited the shocking figure of over \$100 million in overpayments to servicemen during the period of 1957-61. What I am trying to get at is the fact that no committee is holding anyone responsible for these errors in the reports accompanying the bills.

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

Mr. PELLY. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ASHMORE. This bill does not involve exactly the same kind of situation that my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, and I believe my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington have in mind. The matter dealt with in this bill arose at the end of World War II and the entire situation came about at that time. This kind of thing has not happened and has not been reoccurring since that time, but it has been in existence since then. It relieves them from liability for funds that they received as a result of these errors during World War II. As a matter of fact, it would not now cost the Government anything for the amounts were paid out over the 15-year period.

Mr. PELLY. I think there is a question of the overall policy and it is not simply a question of the merits of any one bill as against any other bill. For that reason, and particularly since our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who raised these questions before is unavoidably absent today, I intend to ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over, and I would like him to have the opportunity to discuss it with the gentleman and satisfy himself.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. I would like to inquire further as to the cost of this bill. As I

understand it, the bill provides for refunds of amounts paid by or withheld from such individuals and applied to such indebtedness. This could very readily run into the millions of dollars. There is no estimate here in the report stating how much has been withheld or how much has already been refunded.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is a statement on the bottom of page 3 of the committee report under "Cost and budget data," as follows:

Other than the possibility of a refund in the event a repayment has been made by any person, there will be no additional cost to the Government.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the gentleman, it is my information, the Navy says, there are only 40 men involved.

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. The average cost per individual is said to be \$1,285 so the total cost to the Government could amount to \$50,000 and could not run up to the figure that the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE ADDITION OF CERTAIN DONATED LANDS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEADQUARTERS SITE, ISLE ROYALE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4152) to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(a)(38) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 171; 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(38)), is amended by adding thereto the following sentence: "For the purpose of issuing certificates of citizenship to persons who are citizens of the United States, the term 'United States' as used in section 341 of this Act includes the Canal Zone."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have someone state in behalf of this legislation that it is not the intention to go down to the Panama Canal and establish a new bureau with additional Federal personnel sent there to issue the certificates that are involved.

I would like to have the legislative intent brought out. I am not opposed to the purposes of the bill, but I do not want to see a new staff set up down in the Panama Canal Zone to issue certificates of citizenship.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The committee agrees thoroughly with the gentleman. It is contemplated there shall be no permanent officer down there for this purpose. The committee has been informed that an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service goes down to the Panama Canal Zone two or three times a year, during which time he would be able to take care of the issuance of these certificates.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is speaking of one individual who would go down there and issue the certificates?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is exactly what is contemplated, nothing further.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation a tract of land, or interests therein, located in Houghton, Michigan, comprising 6.07 acres, more or less, bounded on the west by Portage Street, on the south by Seventh Avenue East, on the east by the First Shelden-Columbian Addition and on the north, in part by lands depicted on the supervisor's plat numbered 4 of the village of Houghton. The land acquired by the Secretary shall be added to and administered as part of the administrative headquarters site of Isle Royale National Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5175) to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTING STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 6.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of the late John Burke, presented by the State of North Dakota, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his historic renown and distinguished civic services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of North Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING TEMPORARY PLACE-MENT IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL OF A STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 7.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the North Dakota National Statuary Hall Commission is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of John Burke, to be presented by the State of North Dakota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand six hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of North Dakota, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and two thousand eight hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEREMONIES IN THE ROTUNDA IN CONNECTION WITH THE STATUE OF THE LATE JOSEPH WARD OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the South Dakota State Historical Society of South Dakota is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South

Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENDERING THANKS OF CONGRESS TO SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE STATUE OF JOSEPH WARD, TO BE PLACED IN STATUARY HALL

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 10.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Joseph Ward, presented by the State of South Dakota, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his leadership as author of the State's motto, framer of the Territorial school law, founder of the first college, and outstanding churchman in the founding of Christian churches among whites and Indians: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE PROCEEDINGS AT THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF JOSEPH WARD, TO BE PLACED IN STATUARY HALL

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 11.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be presented by the State of South Dakota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of South Dakota, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of South Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING SHORT MOUNTAIN LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA, AS THE ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 82 designating the navigation channel and canal portion of the Arkansas River navigation and multiple-purpose project as the "Robert S. Kerr Seaway."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the navigation channel and canal authorized as a portion of the Arkansas River navigation and multiple-purpose project authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, as amended, shall be known and designated hereafter as the "Robert S. Kerr Seaway". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such navigation channel and canal is referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such navigation channel and canal as the "Robert S. Kerr Seaway".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir on the Arkansas River in the State of Oklahoma shall be known as Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir in honor of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is referred to by any other name shall be held and considered to refer to such project by the name of Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the House of Representatives has taken such quick action in passing House Joint Resolution 82 to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in Oklahoma to the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir.

This is a measure based on a resolution which I introduced on the first day of this session of Congress, and which has received the enthusiastic support of every Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, as well as the approval of the family of the late Senator Kerr, and of many others who are fa-

miliar with the great work in water development which was initiated and carried on by Oklahoma's late senior Senator.

This proposal is a fitting tribute to this great man who captured the imagination of every Oklahoman and made our State conscious of the great need for water conservation and of the vast potential of water resource development.

The project, which will be located entirely in Oklahoma, will be the first large multiple-purpose structure to be encountered in Oklahoma by vessels moving upstream on the Arkansas navigation channel.

This multiple-purpose water resource development will be a living monument to the man who worked and fought his way from his log cabin heritage to become one of our State's most loved sons and one of our Nation's most progressive-minded statesmen.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of the language in the committee report regarding our late Senator, and have obtained unanimous consent that it may appear at this point in the RECORD:

SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

Senator Kerr's family settled in Oklahoma Territory where the Senator was born 11 years before Oklahoma was granted statehood. He was a son of a self-taught, scholarly father. In his youth he fought diligently for the benefits of a formal education under the most difficult circumstances. Like many another pioneer boy before him, he walked many miles to and from a small schoolhouse. Unable to afford the full college course, the future Senator interrupted his studies at the age of 17 to become a teacher in a one-room school. He enlisted in the Army and saw duty in France as a field artillery lieutenant in World War I. Later, he gained knowledge of the law during an apprenticeship in the office of one of the great early-day Oklahoma attorneys. He worked his way through courses at East Central State College in Ada, Okla., and at the University of Oklahoma.

His natural leadership abilities came to statewide attention when at the age of 28 he was elected State commander of the American Legion. He later ventured into the field of oil and became the principal organizer of the greatest industry ever founded in Oklahoma.

In 1925 Robert S. Kerr married Grayce Breene, the talented daughter of a pioneer Oklahoma oil drilling contractor. Their three boys and one girl have now established families of their own and the love and affection that Oklahoma felt for Senator Kerr was reflected in outpouring of sympathy for his immediate family when he passed away.

Robert S. Kerr's work in civic affairs and as a lay leader of his church brought him recognition rapidly after he moved to Oklahoma City in 1931. He rose quickly to leadership in the Democratic Party in his State, was elected national committeeman in 1940, and became the first native Oklahoman to be elected Governor 2 years later. He became vitally interested in water resources development after a series of devastating floods in Oklahoma combined with drought and depression conditions to produce great economic difficulties. One of his first acts when he came to the U.S. Senate in 1949 was to introduce a bill to create the Arkansas, White, and Red River Study Commission. This resulted in a completely coordinated plan for the development of the soil and water resources of the area. This study

set a pattern for many similar ones throughout the country. As the years passed he became an expert in many fields, but his interests in the conservation and use of our water resources increased rather than decreased. He was chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources which made one of the most comprehensive studies ever undertaken.

Because of Senator Kerr's longstanding interest, his many and great contributions, and his unflagging zeal in the field of public works, the Committee on Public Works endorses wholeheartedly the naming of this public works project for a most distinguished statesman.

The Department of the Army endorses this proposal and its views are set forth in the following letter:

APRIL 1, 1963.

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of the Army with respect to House Joint Resolution 82, 88th Congress, a resolution designating the navigation channel and canal portion of the Arkansas River navigation and multiple-purpose project as the Robert S. Kerr Seaway.

This resolution would designate the navigation portion of the comprehensive project for the Arkansas River and tributaries, Oklahoma and Arkansas, as the Robert S. Kerr Seaway in honor of the late Senator from Oklahoma.

This Department recognizes the great contributions made by Senator Kerr toward water resources development. Therefore, it is considered entirely appropriate that one of the projects near his home be named after him.

Accordingly, the Department of the Army would have no objection to House Joint Resolution 82. On the other hand, the committee might wish to consider (as possibly more appropriate than naming for Senator Kerr a navigation channel extending through Arkansas as well as a portion of Oklahoma, as contemplated in H.J. Res. 82) designating in the Senator's honor a single water resource unit lying entirely within his home State of Oklahoma, for example, the Short Mountain lock, dam, and reservoir project. The Department of the Army would favor this latter course of action, which could be accomplished through appropriate revision of House Joint Resolution 82.

Since the committee has specifically requested that this report be furnished as expeditiously as possible, the views of the Bureau of the Budget have not been obtained with respect thereto. As soon as those views have been received, the committee will be notified.

Sincerely yours,

CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a portion of the committee report at this point in the RECORD and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

REDESIGNATING THE BIG HOLE BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT, REVISING THE BOUNDARIES THEREOF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3200) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask why the Federal Government, if I understand the legislation correctly, buys 306 acres of land then retrocedes jurisdiction to the State of Montana?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government does not retrocede the land to the State of Montana. The Federal Government retrocedes some jurisdiction it has—law enforcement, primarily—and the object of the language which the gentleman refers to is to let the State of Montana be the law-enforcement agency instead of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. It then retrocedes jurisdiction to the State of Montana and does not retrocede the land already existing in the park or the 306 acres that would be purchased under the terms of this legislation; is that correct?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman further about the legislation. As I understand, this bill authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$20,000 for land acquisition. Now, is there any further land acquisition contemplated in the future?

Mr. MORRIS. No. This is the only land that is contemplated in the future, and we are authorizing \$20,000 to purchase the land.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, established by Executive Order Numbered 1216 of June 23, 1910, and enlarged by Proclamation Numbered 2339 of June 29, 1939, is hereby redesignated as the Big Hole National Battlefield.

Sec. 2. In order to preserve historic features and sites associated with the Battle of the Big Hole and to facilitate their administration and interpretation, the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield are hereby revised to include the following described lands:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 2 south, range 17, west: Section 13, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 23, east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 24, west half east half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 25, those portions of the northeast quarter northwest quarter and the northwest quarter

northeast quarter lying north of the north right-of-way line of relocated Montana State Route 43; consisting of approximately 466 acres.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Any lands described in section 2 of this Act that are a part of the Beaverhead National Forest when this Act takes effect are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Big Hole National Battlefield.

(c) Lands included in the Big Hole National Battlefield pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-3), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, after line 3, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana, effective when accepted by said State in accordance with its laws, such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurrent legislative jurisdiction over such lands."

Page 3, strike out all of lines 4 and 5 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums not exceeding \$20,000 as are necessary for the acquisition of lands and interests in land pursuant to this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 138) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, established by Executive Order Numbered 1216 of June 23, 1910, and enlarged by Proclamation Numbered 2339 of June 29, 1939, is hereby redesignated as the Big Hole National Battlefield.

SEC. 2. In order to preserve historic features and sites associated with the Battle of the Big Hole and to facilitate their administration and interpretation, the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield are hereby revised to include the following described lands:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 2 south, range 17 west: section 13, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 23, east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 24, west half east half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half south-

west quarter southwest quarter; section 25, those portions of the northeast quarter northwest quarter and the northwest quarter northeast quarter lying north of the north right-of-way line of relocated Montana State Route 43; consisting of approximately 466 acres.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Any lands described in section 2 of this Act that are a part of the Beaverhead National Forest when this Act takes effect are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Big Hole National Battlefield.

(c) Lands included in the Big Hole National Battlefield pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-3), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurred legislative jurisdiction over such lands.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated no more than \$20,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 138 and insert the provisions of H.R. 3200 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, N.C.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3887) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this legislation entails a cost in excess of \$1 million. Furthermore, it is scheduled for consideration under suspension of the rules. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AGE LIMITS—APPOINTMENT TO U.S. PARK POLICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4893) relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 932, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill the same as the House bill?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes; the gentleman is correct. It is the same.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CONVEY CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO COUNTY OF LINCOLN, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4151) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, upon the payment of the purchase price by the county into the Treasury of the United States, not more than five years after the Secretary has notified the county of such price, which shall be an amount equal to the sum of the costs of extinguishing any adverse claims to the lands to be patented, the costs of any necessary survey, and the fair market value of the lands as determined by the Secretary after the appraisal of the lands by contract appraisal or otherwise, a patent for the following-described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 2,920 acres (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

Range 67 east, township 3 south, northwest quarter of section 2; west half, southwest quarter section 2; all of section 3; northeast quarter and northwest quarter and southwest quarter and northeast quarter of southeast quarter and northwest quarter of southeast quarter and southwest quarter of southeast quarter of section 10. Northeast quarter and northwest quarter and southwest quarter of section 15. Also northeast quarter of southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of southeast quarter of section 15. All of section 14. All of southeast quarter of section 11 and southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 11, and northwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 11.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this Act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the preceding provisions of this Act shall be construed to preclude the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, from purchasing, in accordance with such preceding provisions, only such portion or portions, by legal subdivision of the public land surveys, of the above-described lands as such county elects, nor shall the purchase by such county of only a portion or portions of such lands be construed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of its rights under this Act to purchase, in accordance

with such preceding provisions and by legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, the remainder of such lands, or any portion thereof.

Sec. 4. All moneys received from the conveyance of lands under the terms of this Act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received as reimbursement for costs of appraisal, surveys, and extinguishing adverse claims may be used by the Secretary for said purposes without appropriation.

Sec. 5. The lands described in section 1 of this Act shall be segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, from the date of approval of this Act until the Secretary shall provide otherwise by publication of an order in the Federal Register.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out all of lines 8, 9, and 10, and insert in lieu thereof: "the fair market value plus the cost of any appraisal of the lands as of the effective date of this Act as determined by the".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "2,920 acres" and insert "2,844 acres".

Page 2, strike out all of lines 6 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof: "The northwest quarter, west half of southwest quarter section 2; all section 3; north half, southwest quarter, west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter section 10; southeast quarter of northeast quarter, northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter section 11; all section 14; north half, southwest quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southeast quarter of southeast quarter section 15, all in township 3 south, range 67 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada."

Add a new section 6 to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the County of Lincoln from acquiring title for leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.)."

Add a new section 7 to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed valuable or prospectively valuable; coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 873) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire

of the gentleman from Nevada about the price of this land. As I understand it, this legislation establishes the purchase price as the fair market value as of the effective date of the legislation. I wonder why that wording is used rather than "as the effective date of the taking"?

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

Mr. HARSHA. Certainly.

Mr. BARING. This is a depressed area in particular, and there is a great demand for land. The State is growing out there, and we figured we would peg it at this particular time of the passing of the act in order to prevent land grabbers and have to pay a higher price for the land at a later date.

Mr. HARSHA. I see.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, upon the payment of the purchase price by the county into the Treasury of the United States, not more than five years after the Secretary has notified the county of such price, which shall be an amount equal to the sum of the costs of extinguishing any adverse claims to the lands to be patented, the costs of any necessary survey, and the fair market value of the lands as determined by the Secretary after the appraisal of the lands by contract appraisal or otherwise, a patent for the following-described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 2,844 acres (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

The northwest quarter, west half of southwest quarter section 2; all section 3; north half, southwest quarter, west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter section 10; southeast quarter of northeast quarter, northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter section 11; all section 14; north half, southwest quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter of southeast quarter section 15, all in township 3 south, range 67 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada.

Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this Act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

Sec. 3. Nothing contained in the preceding provisions of this Act shall be construed to preclude the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, from purchasing, in accordance with such preceding provisions, only such portion or portions, by legal subdivision of the public land surveys, of the above-described lands as such county elects, nor shall the purchase by such county of only a portion or portions of such lands be construed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of its rights under this Act to purchase, in accordance with such preceding provisions and by legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, the remainder of such lands, or any portion thereof.

Sec. 4. All moneys received from the conveyance of lands under the terms of this Act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received as reimbursement for costs of appraisal, surveys, and extinguishing adverse claims may be

used by the Secretary for said purposes without appropriation.

Sec. 5. The lands described in section 1 of this Act shall be segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, from the date of approval of this Act until the Secretary shall provide otherwise by publication of an order in the Federal Register.

Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the county of Lincoln from acquiring title or leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.).

Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed valuable or prospectively valuable: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 873 and insert the provisions of H.R. 4151, as passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 4151, was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LANDS AT MOJAVE B. AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4588) to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights the public lands, and the minerals therein, within the area described in section 2 of this Act are hereby withdrawn from all appropriations and other forms of disposition under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601-604), except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, and reserved for use of the Department of the Navy, subject to the condition that part or all of the reservation may be terminated at any time by the Secretary of the Navy upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of termination of the reservation effected by this Act as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Department of the Navy shall make safe for non-military uses the land withdrawn and reserved or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act are those that are now or may hereafter become subject to the public land laws within the area described as follows:

Approximately 312,659 acres, more or less, within the Mojave "B" Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, California, and more fully described as follows:

township 25 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, sections 9 to 16 inclusive, sections 21 to 28 inclusive, and sections 33 to 36 inclusive;

township 26 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, sections 9 to 16 inclusive, sections 21 to 28 inclusive, and sections 33 to 36 inclusive;

township 27 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, and sections 9 to 12 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 3 inclusive, sections 10 to 15 inclusive, sections 22 to 27 inclusive, and sections 34 to 36 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 3 inclusive, sections 10 to 15 inclusive, sections 22 to 27 inclusive, and sections 34 to 36 inclusive;

township 25 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 26 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 27 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 6 inclusive;

township 28 south, range 45 east, sections 31 to 36 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 34 inclusive, all of section 35 except south half of southwest quarter, and section 36;

township 25 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 35 inclusive, and all of section 36 except east half of east half of northeast quarter;

township 26 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 27 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 6 inclusive;

township 28 south, range 46 east, sections 25 to 36 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 25 south, range 47 east, sections 5 to 8 inclusive, sections 17 to 20 inclusive, north half of section 29, north half of section 30, south half of section 31, and southwest quarter of section 32;

township 26 south, range 47 east, sections 4 to 9 inclusive, sections 16 to 21 inclusive, and sections 28 to 33 inclusive;

township 28 south, range 47 east, sections 19 to 21 inclusive; and sections 28 to 33 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 47 east, sections 3 to 10 inclusive, sections 15 to 22 inclusive, and sections 27 to 34 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 47 east, sections 3 to 10 inclusive; sections 15 to 22 inclusive; and sections 27 to 34 inclusive; Mount Diablo meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Navy" strike out the comma and insert "for a period of ten years with an option to renew the withdrawal and reservation for a period of five years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior, and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the consideration of all eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

RE-REFERRAL OF THE BILL. H.R. 5342

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to refer the bill, H.R. 5342, to authorize the Association of Universalist Women to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women, and for other purposes, from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

There was no objection.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, N.C.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3887) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide suitable access to the Cataloochee section of Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to select the location of an entrance road from a point on North Carolina Highway Numbered 107 close to its point of interchange with Interstate Route Numbered 40, near Hepco, North Carolina, to the eastern boundary of the park in the vicinity of the Cataloochee section, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land for the construction of the entrance road, and to construct the entrance road on the donated land: Provided, That the right-of-way to be acquired, by donation, for the entrance road shall be of such width as to comprise not more than an average of one hundred and twenty-five acres per mile for its entire length of about four and two-tenths miles, constituting in the aggregate about five hundred and twenty-five acres of land.

All property acquired pursuant to this Act shall become a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park upon acceptance of title thereto by the Secretary, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of an entrance road on land acquired pursuant to this Act not more than \$1,160,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina, the sponsor of the bill [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3887 authorizes the acceptance of a donation of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road to the Smoky Mountains National Park leading into the Cataloochee area, and authorizes the construction of a road on the land accepted. The land acquired will become a part of the park and be subject to park control, but it will be used entirely as a right-of-way for the entrance road to be constructed. The State of North Carolina will acquire land and deed it to the Federal Government.

Cataloochee is a large and beautiful section of the park. Over 30 years ago this land was taken by the State of North Carolina from the many owners and given to the Federal Government to become part of the park. It is mostly cut over, contains farmhouses and barns and is not wilderness territory. However, it is located near a beautiful stand of virgin timber and contains a mountain stream comparable to Merced River in Yosemite National Park.

This section of the park is very remote and inaccessible, however, at present Interstate 40, going from Knoxville, Tenn., to Asheville is under construction and will pass 8 miles from Cataloochee Valley and only 4.2 miles from the edge of the Smoky Mountains National Park, giving us the first real opportunity to construct an access road at a reasonable cost into this beautiful scenic valley.

Under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, \$25 million is authorized for national park road construction in 1965. I have been assured by the National Park Service that the cost of this road construction can be handled within the limits of that authorization. Therefore, the approving of this bill would not necessitate an appropriation increase above that already authorized.

Last year the Smoky Mountains National Park had 5,200,000 visitors, making it the first national park in American history to have more than 5 million visitors in a single season. There was an 8-percent increase over the preceding year. Most of these visitors entered the park over one road going from Gatlinburg to Cherokee which has been subjected to some of the worst traffic jams found on any scenic road in the Nation. The proposed new road would open up a new section of the park which could be reached on an interstate road in 45 minutes from Asheville or 1 hour and 15 minutes from Knoxville. It will be the most accessible section of the park and will be one of the finest spots in America for picnicking and camping. More such facilities are needed because 50,000 cars of campers were turned away from the

Smoky Mountains Park and surrounding national forests last summer because there was no place to put them. I am familiar with this territory and have visited it often. If we are going to continue developing the Smoky Mountains National Park, and I know that we are and must, this section should be made accessible and should be utilized, and this access road is necessary. It will be of value to people from all over America.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. First, I should like to compliment the gentleman for bringing this bill to the attention of the Congress of the United States. His own great State of North Carolina over a long period has done much to bring about recreation in the areas of that great State. It has done a tremendous job in roadbuilding and in other sectors of recreation. I think this bill should pass unanimously, because with over 5 million people visiting this great section of our Nation and some of the scenic beauties that are there, they certainly deserve legislation of this kind to make it more accessible to the general public of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Florida in his remarks. During my years on the Committee on Interior I have been constantly edified by the efforts made by the great State of North Carolina to solve its own park problems. I can assure the Members of this House that when North Carolina comes to the Federal Government for any form of assistance in this direction that North Carolina has really exhausted every effort that it could make. I think that North Carolina in the matter of parks could very well serve as an example to every State in the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 3887. I know of no opposition on this side. This measure had the unanimous support of the Subcommittee on National Parks and also the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The purpose of the bill has been fully explained by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3887?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be given until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 5497.

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

There was no objection.

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938", approved August 13, 1957, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended by striking out "and 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963, 1964, and 1965".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which we are now discussing is one that I introduced to extend for 2 years the definition of peanuts which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The purpose of this legislation is to permit farmers who want to plant peanuts for boiling purposes to do so, without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments. To give the technical definition of this exemption, let me say that this definition of peanuts excludes from the provisions of acreage allotments and marketing quotas any peanuts which are marketed before drying or removal of moisture—either by natural or by artificial means—for consumption exclusively, as boiled peanuts.

We have had this legislation in effect since 1957. I introduced the first legislation in this regard and similar legislation was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. An exemption for boiled peanuts was first enacted in 1957 and was applicable to the 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops. Subsequently, the exemption was extended for the 1960 and 1961 crops. More recently, the exemption was continued for the 1962 and 1963 crops of peanuts. The Department of Agriculture reported favorably on this legislation, and recommended that the exemption be made permanent. I am in thorough agreement with the Department of Agriculture, but our committee felt that to extend the exemption for another 2-year period would be more desirable so we could constantly be on the alert to see if the program were in any way harmful to the regular peanut program.

In this connection, may I point out that last year there were planted for boiling, approximately 3,000 acres of peanuts, primarily concentrated in five States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi. There is a total acreage of peanuts of approximately 1,560,000 acres. It can be seen from this insignificant amount of peanuts planted for boiling compared to the total acreage that there has not developed any great program for boiling peanuts—but let me say that it is a healthful little industry. There are dozens of farmers who plant peanuts for boiling purposes in my district, and in other areas of the Peanut Belt. In Florida, I know of several little factories that can these peanuts for boiling—one in Belleview; one in Live Oak, and I believe one in either Tampa or Jacksonville. The boiled peanut, Mr. Speaker, is a vegetable, and has an entirely different taste from peanuts used for other purposes. It has proved not to be a competitor for the markets of other peanuts. We are hoping that we can continue to establish a definite market for boiled peanuts, and I believe that passage of this legislation will help this small, but healthy, industry continue to have a modest growth.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Family Farms of our House Committee on Agriculture, I feel that the little industry that has been developed as a result of this boiled peanut legislation, is an interesting factor in showing what can be done by private initiative. Here is a program that supplements other income of the small farmer, and it does not impose upon the farmer the regulations of some of the other farming programs. I sincerely believe that this legislation should get the unanimous support of the House.

May I point out this bill was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and unanimously reported by the full committee.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So we have arrived at the time when a peanut is not a peanut; is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This kind of peanut is a vegetable.

Mr. GROSS. What does it taste like when it is boiled?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would be delighted to have the gentleman taste some, but I am sorry I do not have this can opened at the moment. But, immediately after this discussion, and I mean this quite sincerely, if we can find a can opener, we will open up this can of boiled peanuts. I know my colleague will enjoy the taste of them. They taste entirely different from peanuts that are salted.

Mr. GROSS. What does a peanut look like when it is boiled?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is boiled in the hull in a salty solution. If we can get a can opener, we will open the can now and show the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Can they be used for fishbait? Would they make good fishbait or something like that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have not tried that, I do not know, sir. But let me emphasize the fact that this peanut program has no support price and is entirely out of the Government regulations. I feel sure it has been a very helpful little program for many of our farmers.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is one bill dealing with agricultural products in the South that did not take a trip through the rose garden? Can we rely on that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir, it did not take a trip through the rose garden.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The boiled peanut is one product that is quite different, delicious, and nutritious. I should like to satisfy the curiosity of our friend, the gentleman from Iowa, and any others who want to know what a fine product we offer in these boiled peanuts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will they grow hair?

Mr. MATTHEWS. They have not grown hair yet.

Mr. SIKES. The answer should be obvious. I was raised on them. That is the only thing I can say boiled peanuts are deficient in. They will not grow hair.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa, if it were not in violation of the good conscience, that I know we all have, I might even be tempted to say that it would grow hair, but I do not think it will.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, speaking more seriously, the gentleman from Florida is rendering a fine service in bringing this bill to the floor. The legislation is needed. It interferes with no marketing program. In fact the acreage is so small that an attempt to provide controls would be a costly and ludicrous thing. The bill helps the little grower who is producing just a few peanuts for a specialty product; is that not correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely right. I might point out that many of our farmers, our colored citizens, especially, take advantage of this legislation. Here is a chance to pass a bill—and I know it is not of earth-shaking importance—to help a lot of little people make a living.

Mr. SIKES. That is the whole purpose of the bill. It does not interfere with any marketing program. The volume is not sufficient to justify inclusion in such a program. The boiled peanut is a very fine product and the bill helps the little people who produce this product, and help to make a livelihood for themselves by so doing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my beloved colleague.

Mr. HAYS. I want to help the gentleman all I can, but you should have kept that can closed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, if we could but undo some of the things we have done, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the able chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries whose people plant some of these peanuts, and I am sure enjoy them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the peanut program. I notice in the report that these peanuts are grown in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and Mississippi.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, while they may be grown primarily in those States, this product is not confined exclusively to those areas.

Mr. BONNER. Yes, that is what I wanted to ask the gentleman. Can any State that desires to plant as many of these peanuts as they desire to plant do so?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The answer is yes, but, of course, in two years if the program gets out of hand, the legislation may not be extended.

Mr. BONNER. May I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida of whom I am very fond and for whom I have the highest respect, when the peanut program was lifted during World War II for the purpose of producing oil for the war effort, the States of North Carolina and Virginia had an understanding that should quotas be reinvoked that Virginia would not get less than so many acres nor would North Carolina get less than so many acres. But in the interim there was a vast acreage of peanuts planted in certain States, and when the program came back in these peanuts planted in the war effort were given credit for the reallocations of acreage. The State of Virginia lost a tremendous amount of acreage, likewise the State of North Carolina. That is why I rise here to ask and be certain about this matter. These peanuts, I understand, move in interstate commerce. It is not localized at all. It would be an interstate product.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It has been, I will say to the gentleman, for years, and I want to assure him this has nothing to do with acreage allotments. Let me emphasize again there are 1,560,000 acres under acreage allotment. There are 3,000 acres planted for boiling peanuts.

Mr. BONNER. I remember a distinguished gentleman in this House, who was very active on the Agriculture Committee, when we lifted acreage allotments on peanuts, he said on the floor of the House:

Listen to me, boys; listen to me; we want to get all the gadgets out of the peanut program.

I objected at that time to giving that gadget protecting certain acreage for North Carolina and Virginia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does the gentleman want North Carolina excluded from the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Let me finish my statement to show you why I am interested. We cut that gadget out. As I say, and as I said before, Virginia lost a lot of acreage, and so did North Carolina. I wanted this to be a matter of record, whether North Carolina plants them, Virginia, or Mississippi, or who else plants them, this will not eventually come in as a recognized acreage that is setting up quotas in the various States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I agree with the gentleman, and I appreciate his interest in that point. It will not have anything to do with acreage allotments.

Mr. BONNER. There are plants in Virginia and North Carolina that can peanuts at the present time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not sure.

Mr. BONNER. In your own State you can grow all of the peanuts you want to and send them to a factory to be put into cans of this type?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman much longer because I have only a short time and there are five or six more Members who want to speak.

Let me say to the gentleman, during the life of this legislation of course that can happen. There is no limitation on acreage for boiled peanuts. If this legislation is not good legislation, in 2 years, I will not offer it, and the gentleman can help to defeat it, if it is offered.

Mr. BONNER. I will say to the gentleman it is good legislation. I would like to know what supervision there is and how these peanuts are harvested, if they are machine harvested, and how quickly they are taken to the processing plants.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The best definition of the way they are harvested is pointed out in the record, which says that the peanuts are marketed before drying or removal of moisture by natural or artificial means. They pull up the vines and they handpick the peanuts. That is the way they are handled.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, this may seem like a very insignificant bill; in fact, perhaps in some aspects it is. But, let me point out that there are minority views filed by myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

I want to point out, too, that last week on the floor of this House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] made this statement:

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our friends from the city for helping us pass the farm legislation, and I want particularly—and I mean this very sincerely, indeed—to plead with them again this afternoon to help these wonderful Congressmen who represent the farmers do what is best for the farmers, even though they do not want to do it themselves—some of them.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that perhaps this is true, but, now, what do we have here? The same gentleman from Florida is trying to exempt certain farmers from the supply-management program.

Well, if this is good enough for the peanut farmer, it should be good enough for the wheat farmer, and, it seems highly inconsistent for the gentleman, in a week's time, to take two completely different positions on agricultural programs. Either a supply-management program is good for every peanut grower or not, regardless of the type or size, and, it occurs to me it is rather strange indeed that we can now say a peanut is not a peanut because they are to be sold as boiled peanuts. Therefore, we should be advocating not just a 3,000-acre exemption but freedom for all peanuts, and all peanut producers, and it is on this basis that I think it is bad legislation. It should be subjected to amendment, and perhaps include not only peanuts but the wheat and grain producers and everyone else who does not want supply management.

I wonder if the gentleman from Florida would yield for a question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would be delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. DOLE. On the basis of this legislation, when does a peanut become a vegetable?

Mr. MATTHEWS. When it is put into a can or boiled for use as boiled peanuts.

Mr. DOLE. And there are no limitations on how many acres might be involved?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just as there is a difference between corn and roasting ears. We have always made a difference in the definition for corn on acreage allotment and corn used as roasting ears.

Mr. DOLE. Would it be possible that all of the surplus wheat could be considered peanuts so surpluses of that commodity could be eliminated?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The answer of course is "No."

Mr. DOLE. Do you really think this is consistent and fair to the other peanut producers?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think it is consistent with my own philosophy in trying to help the farmers in every way possible.

Mr. DOLE. It occurs to me, by legislative magic here, we are exempting peanuts from supply management. If we can do this for boiled peanuts, why can we not do it for every other commodity. Certainly, as stated in the minority views, it is simply a program to protect you from government, from the same supply management the gentleman so heartily endorsed last week, and on the basis of this principle, it is wrong.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], as well as myself, when I say that we are heartily in sympathy with the objective of protecting farmers from governmental control. Of course, that is exactly what is proposed here. Our objective in the bill is too restrictive. The same blessings of freedom from governmental control should be extended to all peanut producers and not just that small group of peanut producers which may be producing peanuts for boiling.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a rather restricted parliamentary situation today. I checked with the Parliamentarian on

the possibility of amending the bill. Not even under a unanimous consent request can the bill be amended.

There is no course for us who believe in a marketplace system and would like to extend the same blessings of freedom to all peanut producers but to oppose suspending the rules. In that way the bill likely would stay on the Union Calendar, and, we may hope, would be scheduled by the House Rules Committee under an open rule so the House could then work its will and make a determination by a vote here on the floor of the House as to whether or not all peanut farmers should be set free.

The effect of H.R. 101 is to protect part of the peanut crop—that intended for use as boiled peanuts—from supply management.

It is a milestone of some sort that the Committee on Agriculture finds it necessary, and wise, occasionally to pass a bill to protect American farmers from Government control—the plain-language term for supply management.

It is even more noteworthy that the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, America's foremost advocate of supply management, favors this protection for the producers of peanuts for boiling. His only criticism of the bill is that it does not provide permanent protection from Government control. He recommends that this protection be permanent.

This same protection should be extended to all peanut farmers, and, indeed, to all farmers and all farm commodities.

Meanwhile, congratulations to this small but happy group of farmers who have been able to get Government protection from Government itself.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and object to the vote on the ground that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 37]

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|-----------|
| Addabbo | Brademas | Dawson |
| Alger | Bromwell | Delaney |
| Anderson | Brown, Calif. | Dent |
| Ashmore | Buckley | Derounian |
| Aspinall | Cahill | Diggs |
| Auchincloss | Carey | Downing |
| Ayres | Celler | Dulski |
| Barrett | Chamberlain | Elliott |
| Beermann | Chelf | Farbstein |
| Belcher | Collier | Finnegan |
| Berry | Conte | Fino |
| Blatnik | Cooley | Fisher |
| Bolling | Corbett | Fogarty |
| Bolton, | Cramer | Ford |
| Frances P. | Davis, Tenn. | Forrester |

| | | |
|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Fountain | Kirwan | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Friedel | Knox | Roberts, Ala. |
| Gallagher | Kornegay | Rodino |
| Garmatz | Lloyd | Roosevelt |
| Gary | Long, La. | Rostenkowski |
| Gialmo | Macdonald | Roush |
| Gilbert | Madden | Ryan, Mich. |
| Goodell | Martin, Mass. | St. George |
| Goodling | Michel | St Germain |
| Grabowski | Miller, N.Y. | Saylor |
| Grant | Minish | Scott |
| Gray | Monagan | Shelley |
| Grover | Moorhead | Sheppard |
| Hagan, Ga. | Morrison | Shriver |
| Halleck | Morton | Sibal |
| Halpern | Multer | Smith, Iowa |
| Hanna | Nedzi | Staggers |
| Hawkins | Nix | Steed |
| Healey | O'Konski | Stratton |
| Hébert | O'Neill | Utt |
| Hemphill | Osmers | Walter |
| Hoffman | Patten | Watson |
| Hollifield | Pepper | Whalley |
| Hull | Philbin | Wildnall |
| Jarman | Powell | Wilson |
| Jennings | Purcell | Charles H. |
| Karth | Quillen | Wyman |
| Kee | Rains | |
| Keith | Reid, Ill. | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 303 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to suspend the rules and call up the bill under consideration be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXPERIMENT STATION RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 40) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to continue its support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as required for the effective conduct of an adequate research program.

Sec. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and equipment which are to become a

part of such buildings) which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of grants from the Federal Government.

Sec. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this Act—

(1) the term "State" shall include Puerto Rico;

(2) the term "State agricultural experiment station" means a department established under the direction of a college or university in any State in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts", approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301); or a department otherwise established pursuant to standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which is to conduct agricultural research; and

(3) the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for allocation to the States for the purposes of section 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

(b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally among the States.

(2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the State bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time each such sum is first appropriated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of the State bears to the total farm population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time such sum is first appropriated.

(c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

Sec. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by the Secretary.

Sec. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount greater than the amount made available by such State from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments are made under section 4 of this Act.

(b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of such State, for payment to such State for a period of not more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such allotment is first made available.

Sec. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facilities, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of fund support under this Act.

Sec. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made available for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the amount of such allocation.

Sec. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station authorized to receive payments under the provisions of section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer, to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer appointed by the governing board of such station. Such treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year. Such report shall contain a detailed statement of the amount received under the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experiment station shall by any action or contingency be diminished, lost, or misappropriated, it shall be repaid by the State concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appropriation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

Sec. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress during the first regular session of each year with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2) the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made, and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station established by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this Act.

(b) With respect to any State in which more than one agricultural experiment station has been established, any appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall direct.

Sec. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demand?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 40, comes to the House with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Agriculture. This is the second time that the Committee on Agriculture has reported this legislation. It was first reported in the last Congress and passed on the 30th day of August 1962, without any objection whatsoever from the floor. It reached the Senate too late for consideration over there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan measure. It has had the endorsement of the previous Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, as well as Secretary Freeman.

Companion bills have been introduced by various Members of the House. Authors of companion bills are the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFELL], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], and probably others.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to assist the States in the construction,

acquisition, and remodeling of their agricultural experiment stations. Actually, this is not a new program. I will say to the Members of the House that there is already authority for Federal grants to State experiment stations but there is no particular formula under which the funds are to be distributed.

The principal objective of the bill is to provide an equitable formula for the distribution of grants among the States, which formula will be more or less comparable to that under which funds are now distributed to the Extension Service in the various States.

Mr. Speaker, the formula specifically provides that one-third of the funds shall be allocated to the States on an equal basis, another one-third on the basis of the rural population of each State, and the remaining one-third on the basis of farm population.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that many of the facilities of our agricultural experiment stations are now quite old and very antiquated. They do not fit into the need of a modern, scientific research operation. Agriculture is now faced with many new plant and animal diseases, blights, insects, pests, and so on. Improvement in existing experiment and laboratory facilities is quite essential to meet this threat and to advance new uses and better marketing of agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker, I think this covers the high points of the bill. I shall be glad to yield to any Member who desires to propound a question.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I think the bill is a good one and I am in favor of it. Fine work has been done by the experiment stations. May I inquire of the gentleman whether there is any estimate as to the amount of funds that would be needed under this program? There is nothing in the bill itself that gives any estimate as to what we may be entering into in the way of funding.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This bill simply authorizes that the moneys be distributed to the States under the formula that I have just mentioned. To be a little more specific, the directors of the experiment stations, under the leadership of Dr. Hawkins, of Oklahoma State University, as well as witnesses from the Department of Agriculture, testified that there was now a need for about \$12 million of Federal funds for this purpose.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand the gentleman estimates that about \$12 million will be used and will cover the experiment stations in the various States?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That covers current needs according to the testimony brought to us by the people who operate these stations and by the people in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BOW. On the question of the financing program, section 12 authorizes appropriated sums that may be necessary for the proper administration of the act. Will the gentleman give us some

idea what the cost of the administration of the act will be.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I should not think there would be an additional dime of administrative cost. I do not see how there could be because already we have people in the Department of Agriculture who are administering an almost identical program, except that the distribution of funds is not made under the formula to which I have referred.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman feels that the adoption of this legislation would not mean that we are creating any more positions?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I certainly would not think so; no, sir.

Mr. BOW. And that the appropriation for administration would be about the same as it has been in the past?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Exactly.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me because I do serve on the committee that will have to fund any result of this action. I am happy to see—and I read at this time from the report:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize appropriation of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in the State agricultural experiment stations.

I make note of the word "specifically" and I assume my colleague from Mississippi intends that to mean exactly the way it sounds; that is true, is it not?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not my word; that is what the gentleman finds in the report. I might say to my friend from Washington that this bill sets up the ground rules for the distribution of Federal grants among the States for the erection, repair or construction of experiment stations and facilities, which incidentally are now authorized by law.

Mr. HORAN. I understand, I think, and when the agriculture appropriations bill is on the floor I will be specific myself in informing the House of Representatives that our State agricultural experiment stations in 1962 spent \$15.5 million of Federal funds that were not budgeted or, if they were, it did not come to the attention of the Bureau of the Budget, and it did not come to the attention of our subcommittee; and in 1963, and I have the list here, transfers from other departments to State experiment stations totaled \$16,581,181 that was not budgeted per se, did not come to us in the justifications, and was not handled through the Bureau of the Budget. They were funds that we had appropriated here to other departments and agencies, who in turn transferred this Federal money to State experiment stations without informing the Congress, our subcommittee, the Department, or the Bureau of the Budget of these transfers. It is reasonable to assume that this further \$1 million that I am talking about as between 1962 and 1963, the current

year, has helped to build up the stature of our State experiment stations to the point where it would be an additional argument for your bill here. But I do contend that it undermines the principle of appropriation of Federal moneys, and some stop has to be put to it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has rendered a real service in calling these points to the attention of the House. Of course, the gentleman is not making a point on this particular bill. What he is saying is that certain other funds have been made available to the experiment stations and that his subcommittee was not accorded the information.

Mr. HORAN. We have no control over nor are we interested in the funds that go to the State experiment stations, and I am one of the advocates of the State experiment stations. We have no control over the contributions of individuals or the States. But as members of the Appropriations Committee we are charged with the responsibility of looking into the funds that are included in the regular appropriation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I strongly favor the purposes of H.R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. I support heartily the declaration that it is the policy of the U.S. Congress to continue its support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as required for the effective conduct of an adequate research program.

I believe it should be pointed out that these State agricultural experiment stations are performing a fine function in the research and development of agriculture in this country, as well as in improving the quality of products and bettering distribution and marketing procedures.

One of the best provisions of this type of approach is that the States provide matching funds, so that there is obtained local responsibility and local contribution as well as Federal grants and responsibility in order to insure the good use of the moneys appropriated. As a Congressman representing an industrial area, I believe that this U.S. agriculture policy is good, not only for the farmers, the processors, distributors, and the business community, but also for the consumers. This is a type of agriculture and farm policy of the Federal Government which I strongly favor, and recommend that it continue, especially on the basis of having the individual States participate.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman whether or not this

is a new expenditure or bricks and mortar rather than an operational expenditure.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, it is not a new expenditure. There is already authority in law for making grants to the States for these purposes. Grants up to \$90,000 can be made without any matching at all. The grants referred to in this bill are to be made under a matching formula, dollar for dollar, under a formula which would afford each State a fair share.

Mr. HOSMER. However, the authority for matching in amounts in excess of \$20,000 under the Hatch Act of 1955 has not been exercised; is that correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just do not have sufficient information on that point to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOSMER. According to the report of the gentleman's committee, this is the case and as a consequence I think this is, in effect, a new spending program. I direct the gentleman's attention to the estimate of cost of some \$12 million annually.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not an annual cost. An estimate was made that they now have a need of only \$12 million of Federal funds. That may not be the situation 5 years or 10 years from now. All of these programs are on a continuing basis. Taking the Extension Service, for example, there is no way anyone can estimate what the eventual overall cost of the extension program would be.

Mr. HOSMER. There are at least 100 of these State extension services facilities that would be involved; are there not?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not know how many would be involved. I do not think there would be too many. I think the testimony shows that only about 20 States have plans now for expanding their facilities. There may be more, I just do not know.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I think this program is a poor one and should be defeated at this time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I regret the gentleman feels as he does and I respectfully disagree with him. This is a good program. Through our experiment stations American Agriculture has moved toward heights unexcelled anywhere in the world. Through this program and particularly the authority in this bill, we hope to provide more markets and more uses for our farm commodities. This is a good bill. It is good legislation. It is a good program. I sincerely hope this House will pass this bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. I think we have shown in the past that the really effective assistance the Federal Government gives to American agriculture is through research. This bill provides the formula whereby each State will be able to construct the buildings needed for research. The peculiar problems of agriculture in a particular State can only be handled by the State itself. In this bill, each State receives money according to a formula. I think H.R. 40 is an improvement to make the present law workable and in view of the purposes of the bill, I give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. And I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] for his continued efforts and leadership on this legislation.

It was unfortunate that this bill came up too late in the last session to receive the concurrence of the other body. With the overwhelmingly bipartisan support that has been given this approach by the House in years past, and again this year, it is to be hoped that the other body will see fit to give it its prompt endorsement.

Certainly the work of our State agricultural experiment stations has been among the most fruitful research which has contributed to the emergence of the American farmer as the most efficient and technically advanced in the world. It can do the same in the field of utilization research.

It is fitting that we continue to rely upon and strengthen the efforts of the existing experiment facilities in the historic pattern of State-Federal cooperative effort.

As sponsor of a similar measure, H.R. 7064, I urge passage of this measure to bring about much needed modernization and improvement of the physical facilities for research at State experiment stations. It will fill a basic need in my own agricultural State and across the Nation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation. A similar bill passed the House unanimously last year. It got bogged down in the other body in the closing days of the session, and hence was not enacted into law. This bill has the support of every land-grant college in the United States and has the general support of all the farm organizations as far as I know. I think it is highly essential in these days when we are confronted with surplus agricultural commodities that we have more research in new uses for agricultural commodities. We should also give more attention to problems of transportation, distribution, and related problems. This is a bill in the right direction and I urge its passage.

The bill will be financed through the regular appropriations process and not through the back-door spending technique which has been proposed in cotton legislation now pending in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this legislation. I think it is rather unique in the fact that although it does provide under this formula for a revised distribution, all of the experiment stations are in accord with it. They feel it is a more equitable and desirable distribution of such moneys as are available. I am particularly interested and would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that this money which is to go for bricks and mortar or physical plant facilities

is more necessary probably than it has been in the past. The reason is that many of our experimental stations and land grant colleges have available, particularly in the field of graduate study, fellowships and scholarships, which today they are unable to utilize properly because they do not have the facilities to use them. So this, in my opinion, is the right way, the best way, if we are going to assist in the field of higher education.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is particularly significant that the legislation has a formula of distribution and that no funds will be paid any State except through actual performance under the act. In addition, it requires matching funds of equal amount at the State level, which permits the States to play an important part in the practical application and use of these funds.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in reading the bill H.R. 40 I notice there is nothing in it to identify any specific purpose of the research authorized. It directs itself toward expansion of facilities in the field of agricultural research. Those of us who are on the Committee on Agriculture can appreciate the need for agricultural research, but we think we must also recognize that there is a need for agricultural research in a certain field or a new field; namely, finding, if possible, new markets, new uses, and new crops.

In the Committee on Agriculture we deal continually with the simple fact that research has possibly been too successful and we are able to produce too much. As I read the bill, it seems to me there is no provision in the bill, no reference, no language that indicates the purpose of the bill is anything more than to expand our present type of agricultural research.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman makes a good point. It is a point that was considered by the subcommittee. We held hearings on this matter last year, and also 3 years ago, I believe. To attempt to limit the bill to specific and particular types of research meant that we would lose the benefit of additional research services of which the station may be capable. Reference was often made to this particular point throughout the hearings. We put emphasis on it. We also made reference to it in the report. However, we felt that if we attempted to confine the stations to a particular type of research, it would be making a mistake.

Mr. SHORT. I agree that the use of these facilities should not be tied to any particular purpose for an indefinite time in the future. I cannot help thinking, however, that in some way, somehow or other there should be identification of the direction we want agricultural research to go. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member of the subcommittee and I am not as knowledgeable perhaps as I should be about this bill—there is some language in the committee report

that attempts to indicate that utilization of these additional facilities shall be directed in the field I have just mentioned.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All of the emphasis in the last 2 or 3 years on the part of our agricultural leaders in and out of Congress has been in that direction. I am quite sure that the agricultural scientists are familiar with that situation, and they themselves have been moving more in that direction than before.

Mr. SHORT. The only point I make is this: I would like to have the record on this bill, the committee report, and the record of debate here on the floor of the House indicate that we who are interested in agriculture are interested in emphasizing at this time this field of new utilization, new crops, new markets, and that sort of thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I might say to the gentleman that actually that was the inspiration for this particular legislation. This grew out of an investigation made some years ago by a commission appointed by President Eisenhower. Two pieces of legislation came from that report. This is one. The other passed the House during the 86th Congress but failed to pass the other body.

Mr. SHORT. Being aware of this, as I read the bill, that is why I raised this point. The reason as the gentleman says, which inspired this legislation is not identified in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has made a good point, and I am glad he has made a record of such.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If I might have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi, I would like to go one step further. If we are going to expand research facilities at the agricultural colleges of the country, let a substantial part of it be used to determine why the farmer is not paid a price commensurate with costs for what he produces rather than research for more production.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not disagree with the gentleman at all. I am 100 percent with the gentleman on that particular point.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in the morning paper that 2 dozen eggs can be bought in the District of Columbia, U.S. inspected, supposedly large eggs, for 77 cents. That is less than 40 cents a dozen at retail in the stores of the District of Columbia, one of the highest living cost areas of the country. Farmers must be getting less than 20 cents a dozen for these eggs. No Iowa farmer could survive on that kind of a price.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I agree with the gentleman, as I usually do.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to section 4 of the bill. Subsection (c)

gives the power to the Secretary to prescribe rules and regulations in regard to the formula involved. It seems to me that earlier in this section the formula is very specifically set out, and I wonder what the meaning of this section might be and why this rulemaking power is necessary. I would direct a question to the gentleman from Mississippi, if he would be so kind as to answer, whether or not the rulemaking power of this section would, under any circumstances, give the Secretary the power to prescribe conditions, such as the type of construction or the particular kind of program involved.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There was evidence of a tremendous lack of facilities. The hearings developed that fact. I am not sure, but I think some reference was made in the report to that effect. Each State under the bill will submit its program to the Department. The Secretary was given this power in order that he could specifically eliminate the overlapping of research. Then there is a certain amount of housekeeping incidental to the program. There will be forms upon which applications will be made. There will be forms upon which programs will be submitted. Each State will be called upon to submit its program to the Department. So, we just thought the rulemaking section was essential. The Secretary did not write this bill. He had nothing to do with it. This bill was submitted to the members of our committee by the people who operate this program back in the States. The bill was never seen in the Department of Agriculture until long after it was submitted to us. So there was no effort on the part of the Secretary to grab up any special power.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand, then, from the gentleman's remarks it is intended by the committee and the language of the bill that the Secretary shall have power to decide what particular program the State agricultural institutions are carrying on. He can determine whether they are duplicating or not and whether it is wise or not. This implies that he can control all the work being done by the individual States under the program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not think he could control it any more than he controls it at this time. But certainly someone in the Department should review and evaluate, if not approve, the projects and programs.

Both the State and the Federal Government have an equal voice in this program. There is nothing incumbent on the part of any State to participate in the program. They can get in or stay out, just as they choose.

Mr. TAFT. Would I be correct in the opinion that if a State accepts the money that under this provision the Secretary can prescribe rules and regulations?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Not after they have accepted it.

Mr. TAFT. Which must be complied with in order to participate in the program?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, sir; not after they have accepted it, but before, and

there must be a meeting of the minds as to the kind, type, and character of the research to be carried on.

Mr. TAFT. This does not amount to control, then?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would say that one has no more control than the other. It is a matter of mutual effort and understanding.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 40 is a bill which has considerable merit except for the fact that it appears to delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture the right, duty, and responsibility to administer this act and to disburse any funds which may hereinafter be appropriated as he may deem necessary and proper pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the limitation of section 4. I would be strongly inclined to support this legislation if anyone here on the floor could or would assure me that the operation of this act would be such as to allow the Congress or some appropriate committee thereof, to determine the projects which are to be built and developed. Agricultural research is very important to the economy of our country but to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to have the authority to, in effect, distribute whatever funds may be appropriated pursuant to this legislation is not only improper but is in effect making a political football out of this legislation which should be a vital, nonpartisan operation.

My own State of Kentucky has a National Tobacco Research Center. During 1960 and 1961 the General Assembly of Kentucky appropriated \$1 million for an agricultural science center and for tobacco research at such center. Subsequently the Governor made available an additional \$1 million for construction and research at such center. Thereafter, in 1962, there was appropriated and allocated by the general assembly more than \$2 million for construction and research at this center. Since 1960 the Congress has appropriated more than \$200,000 each year to the Agricultural Research Service for tobacco research, a large portion of which has been allocated to the agricultural research center of the University of Kentucky for this project.

Kentucky has led the way and pointed out that the States can and will do for themselves. It appears to me that under this legislation that Kentucky could well be penalized for its hard work and initiative in appropriating some \$4 million for this tobacco research center out of its own funds. It could well be that the Secretary of Agriculture will determine another research center as the proper forum for research in the tobacco industry and make available Federal funds, some of which will come from Kentucky, on a matching-funds basis to

another research center and thereby bypass the usual and customary procedure of a specific authorization for a specific project because I have been given to understand that appropriations for H.R. 40 will be in the nature of a package appropriation and not specifically designated for any specific projects.

I cannot conscientiously support H.R. 40 in its present form. I will shortly find myself among a very few who will vote against this proposed bill and I would like to vote for it—and would vote for it—if the authority for the selection of the projects rested with the Congress or if the Congress would include in the legislation guidelines whereby the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to follow certain criteria and if the appropriations authorized by this bill would be in a sum certain rather than in an unknown amount. I am advised on the floor today that this bill will involve \$12 million which is unbudgeted for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the cooperative efforts of the Agriculture Department with the various State agriculture experiment stations has aided immeasurably in the tremendous progress which has helped make American agriculture the most efficient in the world. This is one program of the Federal Government that can show some good and positive results.

However, insofar as this bill (H.R. 40) is concerned, I question provisions set forth in this bill that would turn even more power and control of this program over to the Secretary of Agriculture and further, authorize limitless sums as deemed necessary for the administration of this act.

This Nation and our people are not in a good enough financial condition that we can continue to expand existing programs and provide no limit on the spending and funding of such programs.

On page 3, line 16, the bill states:

It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

On page 6, line 12, of this bill is stated:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of this act.

While I can, in the reason of continued agricultural progress, support the good and sound advances brought about by previous related programs, I find it difficult indeed to support a bill that provides such limitless control and cost as H.R. 40 authorizes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 40.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 275, nays 30, not voting 128, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—275

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abbitt | Gonzalez | Moss |
| Abernethy | Green, Oreg. | Murphy, Ill. |
| Adair | Green, Pa. | Murphy, N.Y. |
| Albert | Griffin | Murray |
| Andrews | Griffiths | Natcher |
| Arends | Gubser | Nelsen |
| Ashbrook | Gurney | Norblad |
| Ashley | Hagen, Calif. | Nygaard |
| Ashmore | Haley | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Avery | Hanna | O'Brien, N.Y. |
| Baker | Hansen | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Baldwin | Harding | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Baring | Hardy | Olson, Minn. |
| Barry | Harris | Ostertag |
| Bass | Harrison | Passman |
| Battin | Harsha | Patman |
| Beckworth | Harvey, Ind. | Pelly |
| Bennett, Fla. | Harvey, Mich. | Perkins |
| Betts | Hays | Pike |
| Blatnik | Hechler | Pilcher |
| Boland | Henderson | Pirnie |
| Bolton, | Herlong | Poage |
| Oliver P. | Hoeven | Poff |
| Bonner | Holfield | Powell |
| Bow | Holland | Price |
| Bray | Horan | Pucinski |
| Brock | Horton | Quie |
| Brooks | Huddleston | Randall |
| Broomfield | Ichord | Reid, N.Y. |
| Brotzman | Jensen | Reifel |
| Brown, Calif. | Jelson | Reuss |
| Brown, Ohio | Johnson, Calif. | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Johnson, Wis. | Rich |
| Bruce | Jones, Ala. | Riehman |
| Burke | Jones, Mo. | Rivers, Alaska |
| Burkhalter | Karsten | Rivers, S.C. |
| Burleson | Karth | Robison |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kastenmeier | Rogers, Colo. |
| Cameron | Kelly | Rogers, Fla. |
| Cannon | Keogh | Rogers, Tex. |
| Casey | Kilburn | Rooney |
| Cederberg | Kilgore | Roudebush |
| Chenoweth | King, Calif. | Royal |
| Clark | Kirwan | Ryan, Mich. |
| Clausen | Knox | Ryan, N.Y. |
| Cleveland | Kunkel | Schadeberg |
| Cohelan | Kyl | Schenck |
| Colmer | Laird | Schneebeli |
| Corman | Landrum | Schweker |
| Cunningham | Langen | Schwengel |
| Curtin | Lankford | Secret |
| Daddario | Latta | Selden |
| Dague | Leggett | Senner |
| Daniels | Lennon | Shipley |
| Davis, Ga. | Libonati | Short |
| Denton | Lindsay | Sickles |
| Derwinski | Long, Md. | Sikes |
| Dingell | McCulloch | Siler |
| Dole | McDade | Sisk |
| Dorn | McDowell | Skubitz |
| Dowdy | McFall | Slack |
| Duncan | McIntire | Smith, Va. |
| Dwyer | McLoskey | Springer |
| Edmondson | McMillan | Staebler |
| Edwards | MacGregor | Stafford |
| Ellsworth | Mahon | Stephens |
| Everett | Marsh | Stubblefield |
| Evins | Martin, Nebr. | Sullivan |
| Fallon | Mathias | Talcott |
| Fascell | Matsunaga | Taylor |
| Feighan | Matthews | Teague, Calif. |
| Findley | May | Teague, Tex. |
| Flood | Meader | Thomas |
| Flynt | Miller, Calif. | Thompson, La. |
| Fraser | Milliken | Thompson, Tex. |
| Frelinghuysen | Mills | Thompson, Wis. |
| Fulton, Pa. | Montoya | Thorncerry |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Moore | Toll |
| Fuqua | Morgan | Toleffson |
| Gathings | Morris | Trimble |
| Gavin | Morse | Tuck |
| Gill | Mosher | Tupper |

| | | |
|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Tuten | Weltner | Wilson, Bob |
| Udall | Westland | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Ullman | Wharton | Wilson, Ind. |
| Van Deerlin | White | Winstead |
| Vank | Whitener | Wright |
| Van Pelt | Wickersham | Young |
| Waggoner | Widnall | Zablocki |
| Wallhauser | Watts | |
| Watts | Williams | |
| Weaver | Willis | |

NAYS—30

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abele | Gross | Minshall |
| Bates | Hall | Pillion |
| Becker | Hosmer | Pool |
| Bell | Hutchinson | Rumsfeld |
| Broyhill, Va. | Johansen | Smith, Calif. |
| Clancy | King, N.Y. | Snyder |
| Curtis | Lipscomb | Stinson |
| Devine | McClory | Taft |
| Foreman | Mailliard | Wyder |
| Goodell | Martin, Calif. | Younger |

NOT VOTING—128

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Addabbo | Fisher | Morrison |
| Alger | Fogarty | Morton |
| Anderson | Ford | Multer |
| Aspinall | Forrester | Nedzi |
| Auchincloss | Fountain | Nix |
| Ayres | Friedel | O'Konski |
| Barrett | Gallagher | Olsen, Mont. |
| Beermann | Garmatz | O'Neill |
| Belcher | Gary | Osmers |
| Bennett, Mich. | Giaimo | Patten |
| Berry | Gibbons | Pepper |
| Boggs | Gilbert | Philbin |
| Bolling | Goodling | Purcell |
| Bolton, | Grabowski | Quillen |
| Frances P. | Grant | Rains |
| Brademas | Gray | Reid, Ill. |
| Bromwell | Grover | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Buckley | Hagan, Ga. | Roberts, Ala. |
| Burton | Halleck | Rodino |
| Byrne, Pa. | Halpern | Roosevelt |
| Cahill | Hawkins | Rosenthal |
| Carey | Healey | Rostenkowski |
| Celler | Hebert | Roush |
| Chamberlain | Hempfill | St. George |
| Chieff | Hoffman | St. Germain |
| Collier | Hull | St. Onge |
| Conte | Jarman | Saylor |
| Cooley | Jennings | Scott |
| Corbett | Kee | Shelley |
| Cramer | Keith | Sheppard |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kluczynski | Shriver |
| Dawson | Kornegay | Sibal |
| Delaney | Lesinski | Smith, Iowa |
| Dent | Lloyd | Staggers |
| Derounian | Long, La. | Steed |
| Diggs | Macdonald | Stratton |
| Donohue | Madden | Thompson, N.J. |
| Downing | Martin, Mass. | Utt |
| Dulski | Michel | Vinson |
| Elliott | Miller, N.Y. | Walter |
| Farbstein | Minish | Watson |
| Finnegan | Monagan | Whalley |
| Fino | Moorhead | Wyman |

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Auchincloss and Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. St. Onge and Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.

Mr. Gary with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Floyd.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Burton.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Donohue with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia, with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Beermann.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ayres.

GENERAL PAIRS

Mr. Steed with Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Rostenkowski.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. St. Germain.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Minish with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Madden.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Cheif.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Olsen.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Roush.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Grant.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, 80 years ago when the civil service law was first passed, and called the Pendleton Act, there were very few thousand employees under the act. Today there are more than 2½ million. And so it is necessary that we have representative organizations of the many groups that make up the Federal employment.

Last year there was organized a new organization, the Federal Professional Association, which is recognized, and its purpose is to organize professional employees and to aid them in appearing before the Congress and the many administrative departments of the Government concerning these employees.

I make available to my colleagues in the following statement the aspirations of this organization:

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOUNDING CONFERENCE, THE FEDERAL PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 28, 1962, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, CONSTITUTION AVENUE BETWEEN 12TH AND 14TH STREETS N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Federal Professional Association is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization engaged in research, education, and representation

to enhance the value of the Federal career services to the Nation; foster high standards of professional work in the Government; and generally promote the welfare of professional personnel in the Government.

THE FEDERAL PROFESSIONAL
ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C.
FOUNDRY COMMITTEE

Vincent J. Brown, Ph. D., political science, Howard University.

Charles E. Burkhead, statistics, Department of Agriculture.

Roy W. Crawley, Ph. D., psychology, public administration, Agency for International Development.

Leonard T. Crook, P.E., civil engineering, Army Engineers.

Albert M. Dickson, economics, Department of Agriculture (retired).

Herbert P. Dunning, Public Health Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

W. Brooke Graves, Ph. D., American Government, Public Administration, Library of Congress.

Gregory K. Hartmann, Ph. D., Research and Development Management, Naval Ordnance Laboratory.

Vincent E. Jay, management analysis, General Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lewis P. McCann, Ph. D., cytogenetics, Science Administration, Department of Agriculture.

Lionel V. Murphy, personnel administration, Brookings Institution.

Emmett Sheehan, Jr., law, labor relations, National Labor Relations Board.

Harold A. Stone, P.E., management engineering, Department of the Army.

Denver W. Warnock, general administration, District of Columbia government.

C. Packard Wolle, Ph. D., administration and management, Federal Aviation Agency.

The founding conference met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to notice provided for in article X, section 1002 of the constitution. Dr. Gregory K. Hartmann, chairman of the program committee, presiding. Dr. Hartmann introduced the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, as master of ceremonies.

Mr. Ramspeck, now retired, has been a Congressman from Georgia for over 30 years, and has also served as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He is known and respected by literally millions of employees of the Federal Government. It is indeed fitting that he should preside over this first public meeting of the Federal Professional Association. Mr. Ramspeck.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I should like to read some communications which have been received.

(Mr. Ramspeck read letters of best wishes from Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; Mr. Rocco C. Siciliano, formerly an assistant to President Eisenhower; Mr. Clarence B. Randall, who has been in and out of government for many years and who is well-known in the field of business; the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, an executive of the Eastman Kodak Co. for many years; and a telegram from a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Services Committee, Senator FRANK CARLSON.)

Mr. RAMSPECK (continuing). It is my hope that as the years pass we will celebrate the founding of the Federal Professional Association as a landmark in the progress of better government, just as we will mark the 80th anniversary of the Civil Service Act next month.

When the Civil Service Act was passed almost 80 years ago, we had a Federal Government small in numbers and very limited in its activities. That is no longer true. Today we find our Government greatly expanded in numbers and even more in the

scope of its activities. Whether we like it or not, the hope of the free peoples of the world depends upon the success or failure of the activities of the United States.

The citizens of our country will not hold our public servants in high esteem unless they know what is being done and understand the results being obtained.

Recently when I was in a meeting with Congressman MAHON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Defense Department, he pointed out that today we are trying to run the United States, the rest of the world and outer space. Certainly we need many competent people to meet this challenge.

There are many fine organizations of Federal employees. Most of them are not in a position to do the job which the Federal Professional Association is being organized to do. They must, and do, represent the wishes of the majority of their members whose interests are primarily in salaries, wages, and working conditions. The Federal Professional Association will cooperate with them in these matters, but will also go further and endeavor to improve the management area of Government and the understanding of the public, so as to achieve that esteem so necessary to success in meeting the complex problems facing our Nation.

I hope each of you here will support the association by joining and by urging others to do so. You will be making a real contribution to better government, to your own security and to more satisfaction for your services. You will have made more certain our success in the battle for freedom in the world.

It is now my privilege to present to you a gentleman you have already seen, Dr. Gregory K. Hartmann, nominee for the office of president-elect. A native of New York State, he was graduated from California Institute of Technology, with a B.S. in physics. A Rhodes Scholar, he received a B.A. in mathematics with a special subject in relativity from Queens College, Oxford University, England. He also holds the degree of M.A. Oxon. His Ph. D. in acoustics is from Brown University.

Since 1955, Dr. Hartmann has been technical director of the U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory at White Oak, Md.

Dr. HARTMANN. Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to talk about the evolution of the Federal Professional Association to date and about the reasons back of the choices made in arriving at the constitution and bylaws, which really summarize the principal part of the work of the founding committee for the past 2 years.

It was in December of 1960 that a small group of professional people from various government agencies met for the first time to discuss ways of improving the Federal service and the role of Federal professional employees. These meetings, with ever-growing interest, have continued at monthly intervals since that time. We have met with many Government officials, with Members of Congress, and with representatives of professional societies and employee organizations.

By May of 1961 we had created a document which discussed the need for a professional association of the Federal service, outlined its objectives and considered a possible organizational structure.

It has taken the founding committee over a year to create the constitution and bylaws. They are not perfect; they will be improved; but the principles have been repeatedly discussed, debated, and resolved, and I believe we have a sound foundation on which to build.

Some historical points should be mentioned: Representatives of the founding committee appeared before the President's Task Force on Employee Relations, the so-called Goldberg Committee, in September 1961. We made the plea that the way should

be left open for the formation of a professional association if professionals so desire. The following points were made which outlined our views:

1. There is no means today for the formulation of the opinions of Federal professional employees with regard to their own welfare or to improvements in the Federal service.

2. There are no means today for the representation of such a professional viewpoint before either the executive or legislative branches of Government.

3. Existing employee organizations which are Government wide are not professionally oriented and therefore do not attract professional employees to their membership.

4. There is therefore a need for a Federal Professional Association.

5. It remains to be seen whether a sufficient number of professional employees of the Government have the same opinion and are willing to join, pay dues, assist in the organization or make other sacrifices, however small, of time or money, to promote this cause.

It still remains to be seen, but today we are a lot closer to seeing it. Our charter membership, generated by personal contacts, without benefit of publicity or founding conference, has grown to about 400 members distributed over many states and overseas, and a very fine list it is, too, of influential and, in many cases, highly placed individuals who have come to the same conclusions the founding committee did.

The public view of Government service must be improved. This is a prime responsibility of the professional man in Government. It is his responsibility because he himself is tarred by the same brush that touches any dark spot of incompetence or inefficiency in that Government, whether he likes it or not. He also has the responsibility for recruiting competent people into the Government to work with him. He must be sure that his subordinates are good, or else his own effectiveness will dwindle. Conditions of work, recognition and pay are all parts of the "competition for quality" in our Nation today. We are now more firmly convinced than ever that the enormously expanded Federal role in research and development must be operated by creative and competent professional people who must be in the Government service. How do we get them in? The recent Pay Act takes a significant initial step toward the persuasion of the best professional graduates to choose the Government as a career. There is, however, much more to be done.

In summary, the professional in Government has an obligation to improve the Government as a place for professional work. No one else is so directly concerned, nor so able clearly to see the needs, the problems, and the solutions. And no one else is going to do it anyway. The Federal Professional Association offers a splendid possibility for improving the essential service of Government to the taxpayer. If the professional workers in Government are interested in improving the Government and themselves, now is the time for them to come forward. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our next speaker has had a distinguished career in the military service of our country. He entered the U.S. Military Academy in 1933 and graduated in June 1937 as a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers of the Regular Army.

In July 1959, he was appointed Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army Training Station for Engineers at Fort Leonard Wood.

In 1960, he was appointed Engineering Commissioner for the District of Columbia, in which capacity he is still serving. Brig. Gen. F. J. Clarke.

General CLARKE. It is a real pleasure to talk to this group from several points of view. First, as a District Commissioner, I am glad that the Federal Professional Association is

allowing the employees of the District to become members of the organization. Most of you are aware that District employees are governed almost entirely by the same rules governing regular civil service employees, and they have civil service status as well.

Second, as a professional engineer, I am glad to see that professional engineers are listed among your founding fathers. I think you will find them to be active, vociferous and argumentative members of the organization.

Third, although I have spent my life in the Army, as I look back over some 25 years of service, I find that about 18 years of that service were what I would call nonmilitary assignments; 5 years with the Atomic Energy Commission, 5 years in the Pentagon in a position associated with civil service employees of professional stature, 4 years working overseas on construction in connection with military aid projects, and 2 years in the District Government.

The Government needs people in all of the major professions—in the social, biological, physical, and veterinary sciences; in the fields of medicine, law, engineering, mathematics, accounting, architecture, patent work, education, and vocational training.

The ratio of professional employees to nonprofessional is rising and will continue to rise as we mechanize the more routine, repetitive, and clerical functions. This very process of automation, as well as space exploration, highlights the need for first-class employees. Government must have the scientific and technical competence among its employees to plan, program, evaluate, inspect, and review the services and equipment contracted for and supplied by American industry.

I am glad to see the wage structure being improved and made equivalent to that in private industry.

I find a tendency among the public to equate competence with salary. In my 18 years of association with the professional people of the Federal Government, I have always been astounded at the ability of the Government to keep the people it has managed to keep in the face of competition from private industry to take these people and put them elsewhere at higher salaries.

I know the Atomic Energy Commission has difficulty in recruiting professionals. Yet it needs the best scientific research personnel for this highly specialized nuclear field.

The Federal Government is the only institution in this Nation sufficiently large and publicly oriented to provide the resources for certain of our pioneering exploitations. What private industrial organization could have and would have put a man in orbit around the earth? What corporation would have been able to establish a satellite for weather observation, or more commercially oriented, a communications satellite?

The point I wish to emphasize here is that in our technological evolutionary explosion in the future, more and more tasks will be of sufficient magnitude to require Government sponsorship if not actual execution. Therefore, Government must have the professional know-how in its employees to plan and execute these programs. The Federal Government needs professionals with the creative, imaginative abilities and the managerial competency to keep abreast of the technological advancements.

Another related area of Government where we sorely need more expert performance is in the behavioral sciences to assist us in urban renewal, juvenile delinquency, crime, welfare, etc.

In the first two centuries of our Nation's growth and development, the Federal Government played quite a different role than it will during the next two centuries. Yes, even up to the middle of this century, the Federal Government's role was primarily protective on a national basis and regulatory on an interstate basis. The role I see in the

future, as we live at a more accelerated pace in a more confined geographical area, is one of dynamic leadership both in the world and at home, a leadership which only first-class professionals in the Federal service can provide. Many thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our next speaker, Dr. F. P. Kilpatrick, has, since January 1959, been associated with the Brookings Institution. Graduated from the University of Washington with an M.S. in psychology, he later received an M.A. and Ph. D. in psychology from Princeton University. Before joining Brookings, he was head of the consumer research division of National Analysts, Inc., of Philadelphia. I am very much pleased to present him to you.

Dr. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, as we add up the kind of information that is available from each agency, or what is published periodically by the Civil Service Commission or in testimony before Congress, it adds up to the presumptive case at least that the Federal Government is not doing as well as it should in the competition for first-class professional and technical personnel.

People at all levels are equally interested in the paycheck but interest in financial reward tends to decline as you go up the ladder. Declining very sharply also is interest in occupational security, physical working conditions and nature of supervision. Climbing sharply is interest in the opportunity to be of service to society, challenge, creativity, and self-development.

We found a common pattern of occupational values among all classes of professional employees—physicists, engineers, and executives are substantially the same. They share an interest in such things as creativity, challenge, and opportunity for self-development. It seems to me they probably should have a common interest in improving their lot, and I would think they would have a common interest in the abandonment of the Federal personnel philosophy of benefits of pay and working conditions trickling upward instead of down.

At this point I should like to offer a few suggestions:

1. That this organization at a relatively early date encourage the development of a permanent interprofessional council associated with this organization.

2. That this organization become a source of and channel for accurate and relevant information. This group can furnish this knowledge, not only to Congress, but also to professionals in and out of Government and to the general public.

3. That this organization encourage research and experimentation. I hope it could encourage the transformation of Federal personnel administration from its original negative regulatory role into a far more positive role, which does not depart from equality of opportunity, but which also does not ignore current patterns of differential treatment of personnel designed to enhance quality, creativity, and productivity.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our next speaker, Dr. Wilson Elkins, is president of the University of Maryland. He is an outstanding man and a little unusual as university presidents go. Not only is he a member of Phi Beta Kappa and a Rhodes Scholar but he also was the winner of eight varsity letters in football, basketball and track. Many honors have come to him. I am delighted to present him to you this morning.

Dr. ELKINS. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate the importance of this step you are taking and want to express satisfaction with it, not because you have formed another organization which "joiners" can join, but because of the stated purpose of the association.

It seems to me it is important that you provide a means for public recognition and understanding and that you have some means for expressing your views before legislative

bodies. But of much more fundamental importance is that the association have as its main purpose the rendering of the highest kind of service that the Federal professional employee can render to the country, and to encourage continual improvement on the part of the professional employee. If this is done, I think you certainly will have justified your existence.

As I see it, the universities have a tremendous responsibility here to meet the requests and needs of these professional groups.

There is need for better communication between the professional employee and the universities so that there may be a better understanding. This, I think, can be one of the very important contributions of an association of this kind.

It is encouraging to all of us that this association has been formed for the purpose of improving ourselves. This association can contribute a great deal to the improvement and broadening of the program of additional education. In the process you can set and maintain higher professional standards, strengthen the Federal service, and, more important and above all, derive immense personal satisfaction from knowing that you have done your best to strengthen the society in which all of us live.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is now my pleasure to present a gentleman from the business area who has also had Government experience—Dr. R. D. Bennett, general manager of the nuclear division of the Martin Co. Dr. Bennett received a B.S. and M.S. in electrical engineering from Union College. Later he was awarded a Ph. D. in physics by the University of Chicago, and subsequently an honorary doctor of science degree from Union College. Until 1954 he was technical director of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory. He has been awarded the U.S. Legion of Merit. I present Dr. Bennett, vice president of the Martin Co.

Dr. BENNETT. Greetings. An alternative title to my remarks today might be "The Grass Is Not Really Greener on the Other Side of the Fence."

I am fortunate in having had a wide variety of experience in universities, in the Federal Government, in the Navy, and now in industry. This enables me to make some comments for you on how we are doing in these various spheres as I see it.

The most important thing from your point of view is that the Federal service offer a satisfactory professional career for current and prospective employees. This is essential, of course, as a means of getting competent people.

The first need for establishing a base for a satisfactory professional career is the opportunity for advanced education.

Here in the Washington area, there are unusually fine facilities for advanced education for professional people in the Federal Government. The local universities are slanted toward meeting this need. Maryland has done national pioneering in making advanced education of this sort available either part or full time. Elsewhere, local universities are becoming active in meeting this need, for example, in California and Tennessee.

The second need in developing a satisfactory professional career is the need to pursue a professional program in a live field along the lines of the individual's interest.

The third need in a professional career is the need for an opportunity to do effective administration.

What can the Federal Professional Association do with regard to the problem of administration? It can continue in its efforts to make a Federal career more attractive, sustain and enhance opportunities for educational development and use its freedom to choose its own work, insofar as free money permits it. This association can also work to set high standards for admission to Government and promotion therein, set high

standards for the performance of individuals, strive to improve the administration of Government agencies by sharpening up authority and responsibility whenever possible.

The organization can speak for the professionals in Government in a way in which they cannot speak at the present time. There is no mechanism through which they can make their peculiar knowledge and ability effective in improving the operation of the Federal Government.

I feel this organization can have an important bearing on the future of the Federal service if you will always keep in mind that you are an important factor in the cast of the "greatest show on earth," the U.S. Federal Government; and if you continue to be guided by President Kennedy's words—not what our country can do for us but what we can do for our country. I thank you.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our next speaker this morning is the Honorable ARNOLD OLSEN, Congressman from Montana. He serves as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. OLSEN. I have yet to be contacted by any of my constituents in the western district of Montana who are professional employees concerning pay or conditions of employment.

How much importance should be placed on pay and conditions of employment? In my travels through my district, I have some opportunity to learn of the technical needs of professional people, but only to a very limited extent. Certainly, Congress is willing and able to provide the needs of the professionals to do their research jobs or the application of their research. The function of Congress is to provide the means; your function is administration. However, I think Congress must be called upon by professional people to do something more about their group than that, more in this field of pay and working conditions.

I want to do these things but don't know exactly how. The best way for me, or any Member of Congress, to get information on any subject is to have spokesmen for the various interested groups talk. So far as professional employees are concerned, the spokesman has been the Civil Service Commission and this is not sufficient.

The Civil Service Commission cannot do its job well in this respect unless it hears from people concerned. The Commission is busy with many activities and therefore hears mainly from groups.

As you probably know, the postal organizations carried the ball for the pay increase legislation and they did not stop with the individual members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. They went to their own Congressmen. But when you pass above GS-5 or GS-6, there are no spokesmen for Federal employees carrying the ball with the Congress. There is not enough genuine, responsible, political activity among professional employees reporting their particular cases to the Congressmen from their respective districts, so that they will have a sympathetic knowledge of the problem when it comes up on the floor of the House.

Certainly, there is nothing wrong with saying what you should have for yourselves as compensation for your ability, training and experience, and also what the Federal Government must have in order to attract the best qualified personnel in the country.

As an organization, you can finance your activities better. This provides the medium and the means for qualified members to speak to the Congress, which must be educated by the leaders of these Federal employee groups. The Federal service will attract the best as it pays the best. I don't know why we could not pay the best in dollars. Some argue that permanence and good conditions of employment enable the United States to pay less. I am inclined to believe that unless we keep abreast of

the pay for professional employees in private employment, we won't have the best kind of leadership and the best kind of program, and therefore we won't be doing the best service for our country.

The need of Congress from your organization is somewhat political but also is all practical; it is a question of selling a program of high pay and high standards of employment to the Congress. I think you ought to sell it by explaining that it would not make many millions of dollars of difference. The Members haven't time to sit down to figure it out; your organization should figure it out to show the effect on the Federal budget. This is a program I hope you will embrace in your overall organization. Thank you.

Mr. RAMSPECK. And now, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Leonard T. Crook, of the Army Engineers, who is a member of our founding committee, will give us a report on the results of the mail ballot to charter subscribers. Mr. Crook.

Mr. CROOK. Over 400 ballots were mailed to our charter subscribers. There were 146 votes cast on the constitution; there were 142 for, 1 against with a detailed explanation of why, and 3 not voting.

In the vote for the officers, the count was as follows:

C. E. Burkhead, treasurer, 146 for.

Harold A. Stone, secretary, 145 for.

Lewis P. McCann, vice president, 144 for.

Gregory K. Hartmann, president-elect, 143 for.

Vincent E. Jay, president, 145 for.

In this same ballot we were adopting a constitution, voting for officers, and asking for a program.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our final speaker this morning is our newly elected president, Mr. Vincent E. Jay, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A native of Ohio, Mr. Jay received his education in personnel management and public administration at Rutgers and American Universities. He is assistant to the executive officer, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Public Health Service. He has been a management analyst in the management division of the Department of Administration in the District government and several Federal departments and agencies.

He established and served as chairman of the founding committee of this association. I am very pleased to present your newly elected president, Mr. Jay.

Mr. JAY. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am greatly honored by the action of the founding committee and the charter subscribers in electing me as the first president of the Federal Professional Association and I shall do the very best that I can on behalf of all professionals. It is with the greatest humility that I accept this high office. I find great comfort in the very fine slate of officers whom you have elected to serve with me. I look forward with confidence to our continued association, and to meeting with other association officials yet to be selected, including the many members who will provide guidance and support.

Together, all of us will look to existing professional associations and societies for cooperative relationships and support. The FPA is designed to complement and strengthen existing professional organizations in their quest to advance their particular professions. The nascent professions in the administrative field particularly need aid in establishing themselves in the area of public administration. There must be a mutuality of concern, a cooperative quest for quality, and a sustained striving for public recognition and acceptance if we are to advance and strengthen professionalism in the Federal service.

The ability and talent that exist among professionals in the Federal service are tremendous. Put to work within the frame-

work of the FPA, this vast resource can revolutionize the Federal service to the end that it will advance and strengthen the economic and scientific position of our Nation. There are great possibilities existing for work of this sort to bring about better management of the Nation's resources and to make them more effective.

The objectives, listed in the order of the greatest number of votes received are: (1) Improve the public image, (2) increase membership, (3) reestablish a separate and distinct classification category for professionals, and (4) inform Congress as to the need for and benefits of differential treatment for professional employees.

To meet the objectives of this association effectively will require considerable time and effort by the association's officers, committees, consultants, and employees. Their duties will involve conferences with department and agency heads and other high officials in the executive branch of the Government; conferences with and hearings before Senators, Representatives, and congressional committees; research, surveys, and studies affecting professional career personnel; representation of Federal career professionals before civic bodies, fraternal, and service organizations, and other groups whose understanding and good will are vitally important to us.

We should reflect on this:

This administration and the Congress have adopted a policy of comparability between Federal and private industry salaries. This is different from Government leadership which existed 30 years ago, but it is a step in the right direction. We have not yet achieved comparability and there is no assurance that we will. No future Congress is beholden unto a predecessor Congress. It may well be that the effective establishment of the FPA may considerably accelerate the necessary future steps toward this desirable goal. This requires from each of us—in fact, from every administrative, professional, and technical employee in the Federal service—the kind of financial and personal support, and even self-sacrifice, that our professional colleagues in private industry willingly give to the organizations that represent them.

CONCLUSION

Questioner (Mr. MOULTON): Is there anyone the committee has in mind for carrying the message forward?

Mr. JAY. We are delighted to make this a separate item to be announced now. We are very indebted to this dedicated public servant of many years, and we are privileged and pleased now to announce the appointment of the Honorable Robert Ramspeck as principal legislative consultant for the Federal Professional Association.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If anyone is going to represent you professional people, I want to emphasize again what Congressman OLSEN said: Members of Congress don't pay much attention to people in the District of Columbia unless they are backed up by the people back home. This is the down-to-earth truth about the life of our Government. I think every Member of Congress feels happy to see the representatives of organizations and get information from them. He also wants to know, however, whether you represent anyone who votes in his district or State and whether or not you are expressing his views.

Our conference stands adjourned. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY HINDERS DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, in recent years when local governments have had great difficulty as a result of flood or other disastrous occurrences, an SOS has come to Washington for hurry-up relief. More and more when the effort is made to grant the relief sought by such local governments, we find overlapping efforts by various agencies in the Government which only serves to emphasize the trouble that the people back home experience with bureaucracy. Recently in Georgia we had some heavy rainfalls in 10 northeast Georgia counties which were declared eligible to receive disaster relief. The President allocated about \$375,000 to assist them.

The editor of the Dahlonega Nugget, Dahlonega, Ga., has included in his editorial comments a description of how these various agencies came in; and after they were paid, according to his best figures, left about 25 cents for the county.

I include as part of my remarks the editorial by Mr. Jack Parks, of the Dahlonega Nugget.

The editorial follows:

The President some time ago set aside \$375,000 for emergency disaster relief in 10 northeast Georgia counties following the recent flooding rains.

This program looked good. An emergency planner came in next day after the big rain (9.53 inches in some places within 24 hours). It was still raining, however, and this fellow floated around over the county and got a little wet. He estimated the damage to be at least \$60,000 on public roads.

Civil defense then sent in their men. By this time the sun was shining and a whole bunch came.

After hearing about this Federal expenditure, the Bureau of Public Roads sent in its men.

Now the woods are full of emergency planners, advisors, inspectors, coordinators, district men, area men, State men, and Federal men. All of them have different ground rules, plans and recommendations.

After spending several days with various and separate groups of experts, County Commissioner Y. D. Jones is trying to organize them into a brigade, hoping that he can take all together on one tour to see if they can agree on how many nails and planks the Government will pay for.

Then he'll attempt to get agreement among the emergency planners, the civil defenders and the bureau men as to whether they will pay for bridge repairs and/or just culverts plus or minus gravel washed away.

Close as the Nugget editor can count on his fingers, it will take \$274,499.75 to pay these speckled-bow-tie boys (if the sun continues to shine) and the several counties involved will have to split the remaining 25 cents among themselves as best they can in a coordinated effort. Only way we see to get any more money is to take it from salaries and/or expenses of the experts.

Please, Mr. President, don't send us any more disaster men! They're trampling down our young timber and mountain wildflowers.

This only will bring on more flooding, plus another deluge of experts.

U.N. PROGRAM TO AID CUBAN AGRICULTURE PROTESTED

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, again I rise to raise my voice in angry protest against the U.N. Special Fund project to aid Communist Cuba with an agricultural program.

I was again shocked to read that an agreement had been signed wherein the U.N. Special Fund and Cuba would share the cost of a project to aid Cuban agriculture, and the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization would carry it out.

It is reported that the project calls for the Fund and Cuba together to spend \$3 million to set up an agricultural research institute in Cuba. A spokesman for the Fund is reportedly to have said that Leonardo Fernandez Sanchez, Cuban Ambassador to Italy, and Jan Huyser, an official of the FAO, signed the so-called plan of operation at FAO headquarters in Rome, April 10, and Paul G. Hoffman, managing director of the Fund, signed it at the United Nations headquarters on April 15.

In my opinion, this one program has done more to damage the United Nations in the eyes of the American people than any other.

Today I wrote a letter to American U.N. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson in which I stated that the unfortunate events in Katanga, coupled with other events, in my opinion, have lowered the prestige of the United Nations in this country to a dangerous level.

I had objected to this program when it was first announced and in a letter to me on March 8, 1963, Mr. Stevenson informed me that he had also objected to this program and "has no hesitancy in vigorously opposing an unsound, ill-timed project." I applaud him for objecting, but this is not enough.

Personally I am not convinced that Mr. Hoffman is doing a first-rate job of directing the Special Fund if this is any indication. Here we find a Communist government having ruined the Cuban economy, and then find the United Nations approving a \$3 million project to aid that faltering Communist economy.

Here we find this Nation, indirectly, in my opinion, giving aid and support to a sworn and deadly enemy, as serious as we have ever faced. To say that no U.S. funds are going to be used in this project is ridiculous on the face of it. Here we find this Nation carrying a disproportionate share of the cost of the United Nations, and then having that organization giving aid to a dictatorial Communist nation is irresponsible at best.

We cannot allow the U.N. to subvert the foreign policies of this Nation in this fashion, because it is the United States

that bears the brunt of financing the United Nations.

I have asked Ambassador Stevenson one pointed question. Is Cuba paid up in its dues and assessments to the United Nations?

I think the answer to this question is important. Has this nation that the U.N. now seeks to aid paid its so-called share of operating the United Nations?

This program, in my opinion, has dealt a severe blow to the prestige of the United Nations.

I cannot support the U.N. Special Fund or the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization if this is any example of the work they are doing. The foreign aid that this Nation gives to other nations is the province of the Congress, and I think it is time that all such activity of the United Nations was halted. I do not intend to vote for funds to be given to the United Nations that will wind up in the hands of a Communist nation, to help sustain a dictatorial scourge like Castro of Cuba.

It seems to me that the Congress should fully investigate this matter.

WEST VIRGINIA: STILL SHORT-CHANGED IN SPACE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include some tables and statistical matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention the Annual Procurement Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1962.

In glancing through this report, I was very much disturbed to note the facts revealed in several of the tables. National Aeronautics and Space Administration has made a great deal of its contention that the space program has provided widely distributed benefits to the American economy. Yet a State-by-State breakdown of NASA procurement for the fiscal year 1962 reveals that not a single contract and not a single dollar went to the State of West Virginia in direct awards of \$25,000 and over.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration has also made much of the fact that the space program is benefiting labor surplus areas. The same procurement report gives a State-by-State and city-by-city breakdown of direct awards of \$25,000 and over to cities in labor surplus areas. Not a single dollar of this amount went to any labor surplus area in West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, of course, some subcontracts were awarded in West Virginia, but I submit that any program claiming to assist labor surplus areas and which grants not a single dollar in prime contracts to the State of West Virginia is misleading.

I would like to underline, Mr. Speaker, that since 1961 the State of West Vir-

ginia has advanced from the bottom of the heap up to 30th place in the Nation in the per capita amount of defense contracts awarded. Yet in the space program no similar progress has been re-

corded. I would be the first to protest if political or geographical favoritism were the rule for awarding any Government contract. But I wish to state that if all other factors are equal then some

preference should be given in establishing installations in those areas where an excessive trained or trainable labor supply will insure that adequate manpower is available to carry out the mission.

U.S. geographical distribution of NASA procurement direct awards of \$25,000 and over,¹ fiscal year 1962

| State | Actions | | Obligations | | State | Actions | | Obligations | |
|---------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | Number | Percent of total | Amount (thousands) | Percent of total | | Number | Percent of total | Amount (thousands) | Percent of total |
| Total | 2,707 | 100.0 | \$939,143 | 100.0 | Missouri | 40 | 1.5 | \$70,600 | 7.5 |
| Alabama | 220 | 8.1 | 81,264 | 8.7 | Nevada | 3 | .1 | 435 | (?) |
| Alaska | 11 | .4 | 4,227 | .5 | New Hampshire | 7 | .3 | 320 | (?) |
| Arizona | 18 | .7 | 5,583 | .6 | New Jersey | 130 | 4.8 | 26,980 | 2.9 |
| Arkansas | 1 | (?) | 37 | (?) | New Mexico | 9 | .3 | 1,696 | 2 |
| California | 784 | 29.0 | 441,179 | 47.0 | New York | 200 | 7.4 | 55,301 | 5.9 |
| Colorado | 27 | 1.0 | 3,622 | .4 | North Carolina | 10 | .4 | 1,695 | .2 |
| Connecticut | 45 | 1.7 | 3,796 | .4 | Ohio | 114 | 4.2 | 11,320 | 1.2 |
| Delaware | 1 | (?) | 34 | (?) | Oklahoma | 11 | .4 | 687 | (?) |
| Florida | 85 | 3.1 | 50,925 | 5.4 | Oregon | 1 | (?) | 33 | (?) |
| Georgia | 24 | .9 | 3,352 | .4 | Pennsylvania | 105 | 3.9 | 25,291 | 2.7 |
| Illinois | 63 | 2.3 | 8,403 | .9 | Rhode Island | 3 | .1 | 243 | (?) |
| Indiana | 23 | .8 | 1,646 | .2 | South Dakota | 1 | (?) | 98 | (?) |
| Iowa | 14 | .5 | 1,898 | .2 | Tennessee | 19 | .7 | 2,163 | .2 |
| Louisiana | 19 | .7 | 18,534 | 2.0 | Texas | 146 | 5.4 | 32,755 | 3.5 |
| Maryland | 154 | 5.7 | 26,773 | 2.9 | Utah | 1 | (?) | 37 | (?) |
| Massachusetts | 141 | 5.2 | 19,737 | 2.1 | Vermont | 3 | .1 | 112 | (?) |
| Michigan | 64 | 2.4 | 5,644 | .6 | Virginia | 91 | 3.4 | 13,785 | 1.5 |
| Minnesota | 31 | 1.1 | 2,927 | .3 | Washington | 4 | .1 | 325 | (?) |
| Mississippi | 1 | (?) | 93 | (?) | Wisconsin | 23 | .8 | 4,618 | .5 |
| | | | | | District of Columbia | 60 | 2.2 | 10,975 | 1.1 |

¹ Excludes awards placed with or through other Government agencies, awards outside the United States and actions on the Jet Propulsion Laboratory contract.

² Less than 0.1 percent.

AWARDS PLACED IN LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

Of NASA's direct awards of \$25,000 and over, \$371 million or 40 percent was placed in areas which, at the time of award, were designated by the Department of Labor as substantial labor surplus areas. Awards by city within each labor surplus area are shown in appendix III.

The categorization by labor surplus area is based on the location where the items are to be produced or supplied from stock; where the services will be performed; or with respect to construction contracts, the construction site.

ACTIVITY BY PROCUREMENT OFFICE

Most of NASA's purchases and contracts are made by the procurement offices of its field installations. During fiscal year 1962 these offices accounted for 96 percent of the procurement dollars and 95 percent of the procurement actions.

In terms of dollars, Marshall and Western Operations accomplished the highest placements. Together, these offices accounted for 56 percent of the total procurement. In terms of actions, Marshall and Langley were most active. These offices accounted for 37 percent of the actions accomplished.

Procurement responsibility and fiscal responsibility for an action are frequently at different installations. Consequently the dollar values of the actions shown for each installation in figure 10 are not necessarily in agreement with the fiscal records of the respective installation.

APPENDIX III

Awards placed in labor surplus areas direct actions of \$25,000 and over¹ by city, fiscal year 1962

| | Thousands of dollars |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Alabama: Birmingham | 2,499 |
| Alaska: Fairbanks | 972 |
| California: | |
| Anaheim | 1,716 |
| Arcadia | 99 |
| Azusa | 40,220 |
| Banning | 32 |

¹ Excludes awards placed with or through other Government agencies, awards outside the United States, and actions on the JPL contract.

Awards placed in labor surplus areas direct actions of \$25,000 and over by city, fiscal year 1962—Continued

Thousands of dollars

California—Continued

| | |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Bell | 52 |
| Burbank | 384 |
| Canoga Park | 100,370 |
| Chula Vista | 1,190 |
| Costa Mesa | 26 |
| Covina | 106 |
| Culver City | 3,990 |
| Downey | 43,357 |
| El Cajon | 129 |
| El Monte | 144 |
| El Segundo | 509 |
| Fontana | 1,125 |
| Fullerton | 316 |
| Gardena | 123 |
| Glendale | 91 |
| Hawthorne | 430 |
| Inglewood | 96 |
| Lancaster | 36 |
| Long Beach | 499 |
| Los Alamitos | 341 |
| Los Angeles | 20,049 |
| Malibu | 1,941 |
| Manhattan Beach | 25 |
| Monrovia | 1,325 |
| Mountain View | 539 |
| Newport Beach | 109 |
| Oxnard | 31 |
| Palo Alto | 103 |
| Pasadena | 1,864 |
| Redlands | 152 |
| Redondo Beach | 109 |
| Riverside | 70 |
| San Diego | 28,044 |
| San Gabriel | 27 |
| Santa Ana | 1,437 |
| Santa Monica | 37,418 |
| South Pasadena | 29 |
| Sunnyvale | 79 |
| Torrance | 294 |
| Van Nuys | 2,142 |
| Vernon | 289 |
| Connecticut: Middletown | 485 |

Florida:

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| Fort Lauderdale | 956 |
| Miami | 210 |
| St. Petersburg | 470 |
| Sarasota | 182 |

Awards placed in labor surplus areas direct actions of \$25,000 and over by city, fiscal year 1962—Continued

Thousands of dollars

| | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Indiana: | |
| Michigan City | 33 |
| South Bend | 46 |
| Louisiana: New Orleans | 14,534 |
| Maryland: | |
| Baltimore | 2,398 |
| Cockeysville | 70 |
| Elkton | 130 |
| Hagerstown | 96 |
| Shadydale | 25 |
| Timonium | 60 |
| Massachusetts: | |
| Lowell | 146 |
| North Andover | 64 |
| Michigan: | |
| Caro | 48 |
| Detroit | 1,145 |
| Highland Park | 620 |
| Holland | 33 |
| Jackson | 33 |
| Pontiac | 1,438 |
| Southfield | 32 |
| Warren | 274 |
| Weston | 64 |
| Wyandotte | 61 |
| Missouri: | |
| Joplin | 27 |
| Kansas City | 663 |
| St. Louis | 1,472 |
| New Jersey: | |
| Bellefonte | 47 |
| Bloomfield | 26 |
| Boonton | 92 |
| Bound Brook | 60 |
| Camden | 1,281 |
| Clifton | 38 |
| Denville | 425 |
| Little Falls | 44 |
| Long Branch | 1,153 |
| Metuchen | 709 |
| Morristown | 45 |
| Murray Hill | 34 |
| Newark | 123 |
| Nutley | 382 |
| Paramus | 74 |
| Patterson | 32 |
| Princeton | 10,892 |
| Somerville | 30 |
| Teterboro | 1,497 |

Awards placed in labor surplus areas direct actions of \$25,000 and over by city, fiscal year 1962—Continued

| | <i>Thousands of dollars</i> |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| New Jersey—Continued | |
| Trenton | 30 |
| Union | 366 |
| West Caldwell | 97 |
| New York: | |
| Buffalo | 1,367 |
| Dunkirk | 124 |
| East Aurora | 483 |
| Elmira | 27 |
| Hudson Falls | 309 |
| North Tonawanda | 27 |
| Schenectady | 317 |
| Silver Creek | 45 |
| Syracuse | 30 |
| Utica | 62 |
| North Carolina: | |
| Corolla | 33 |
| Durham | 346 |
| Ohio: | |
| Akron | 94 |
| Athens | 43 |
| Cleveland | 2,670 |
| East Palestine | 43 |
| Mount Vernon | 177 |
| Sandusky | 1,333 |
| Pennsylvania: | |
| Allentown | 477 |
| Ambridge | 78 |
| Blue Bell | 92 |
| Bradford | 153 |
| Callery | 319 |
| Chester | 480 |
| Conshohocken | 38 |
| East Pittsburgh | 1,678 |
| Erie | 89 |
| Hatboro | 1,242 |
| Jeannette | 34 |
| Lester | 63 |
| Philadelphia | 16,002 |
| Pittsburgh | 1,669 |
| Pottstown | 88 |
| Scranton | 93 |
| South Hampton | 583 |
| State College | 150 |
| Swarthmore | 45 |
| Warren | 121 |
| Willow Grove | 27 |
| Yardley | 100 |
| Rhode Island: | |
| Bristol | 50 |
| Cumberland | 148 |
| Warwick | 45 |
| Tennessee: | |
| Bristol | 1,469 |
| Knoxville | 30 |
| Washington: Spokane | 36 |
| Wisconsin: Milwaukee | 195 |

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

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman for this message and for calling this to the attention of the House. I think there are other States similarly situated that feel very strongly the same way.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

THE NEAR EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise again out of concern for peace in the Near East. In a speech on the floor of the House on March 12, I called attention to the then emerging political and military pattern in the Near East which could be a matter for serious concern. I noted that the Secretary of State's re-statement of March 8 of our concern for the independence and security of Jordan and Saudi Arabia was pertinent and timely. I expressed the hope that the President would instruct our Ambassadors as may be appropriate in the relevant countries to reaffirm that our policy embraced peaceful and friendly relations with all countries in the Near East and that any threat to the peace will result in prompt action by the United States consistent with the U.N. Charter.

Since then the United Arab Republic, Syria, and Iraq have signed an Arab unity proclamation on April 17 calling for a tripartite United Arab Republic to be decided by plebiscite on September 27. The agreement and proclamation calls for the establishment of a joint military command "capable of liberating the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and imperialism."

Mr. Speaker, the document is a rather extraordinary state paper. It was signed in Cairo on the 17th of April by President Jamal Abdan-Nasir on behalf of the United Arab Republic, Lt. Gen. Luay al-Atasi, head of the Syrian delegation, and by Ahmad Hasan al-Bakr, head of the Iraqi delegation.

Specifically I wish to quote from this official proclamation.

Under the general heading "The Structure of the State," this proclamation made clear the purpose of a joint or unified military command, and here I quote from the exact text of the proclamation:

The establishment of a military unity capable of liberating the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and imperialism, realizing the Arab homeland's aspiration for stability and order, and mobilizing its efforts for the establishment of justice, right, and peace.

Mr. Speaker, both prior to and subsequent to the signing of this proclamation, the radios in the several countries in the Near East have been indeed active. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is not an understatement to point out that certain radios in the area have been clearly inflammatory, and before quoting just a few of these excerpts from the radios, let me talk briefly about the policy of the United States in the Near East.

The United States has always believed in friendly relations—close and friendly relations—with all nations in the Near East. Secretary Dulles on February 6, 1956, said:

The foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel. It also embraces the principle of maintaining our friendship with Israel and the Arab States.

Mr. Speaker, quite obviously the situation in the Near East today is sensitive.

I believe there is a need for the U.S. policy to be clear. Admittedly, there are no simple answers. This is an extraordinary complex subject; but I believe that the statements of several radios in the area and certain other actions that have taken place call at this time for a broad-gaged, bipartisan, concurrent resolution of the Congress bespeaking the will of the people of the United States and the united sense of the Congress and the Executive. I believe that such a concurrent resolution could make a significant difference before events in the Near East deteriorate and we are faced with armed hostilities.

Mr. Speaker, before introducing this resolution I would like to quote a few of the statements—the inflammatory statements—of the radios in the area which have had some impact already in Jordan and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I quote first from the Voice of the Arab Nation, which is a clandestine radio station in the United Arab Republic. It broadcast on March 19, 1963, in Arabic to the Middle East:

Free Arab soldiers and officers: The people call on you to shoulder your full responsibilities in the forthcoming battle for the liberation of Palestine. * * * Free officers, come forward and set the zero hour; surge like flames to the palaces in Riyadh and Amman and destroy the hireling traitors, enemies of God and of the people. We will then march together to our dear usurped land, Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Haifa, and the crime of Israel will no longer exist. We call the army and the people in the Arabian Peninsula and Jordan to quick action and to the bloody revolution. Death to the enemies of God and of the people.

There were subsequent statements on the radio after that, but the one I would like to call to the attention of the House today is the one which occurred on April 21, 1963. This was after there had been some disturbances in the old city of Jerusalem in Jordan. I quote again from the broadcast of the Voice of the Arab Nation:

Free valiant men in Arab Jordan: The Voice of the Arab Nation greets your heroic struggle, your admirable demonstrations, and your bloody revolution to deliver Jordan from traitorous lackeys who have sold the country to the enemies of the Arabs and Islam.

The Arab people, who know that many thousands of your heroic officers and men and fedayeen are surging toward unity, freedom, and socialism, support your present struggle and stand by your fight to destroy the throne of traitor Husayn and the head of his uncle, Nasir Ibn Jamil, people's enemy No. 1, to demonstrate and rebel until our common aspirations to make Jordan the fourth region of the U.A.R. are achieved and consequently with all Arab revolutionary energies, governmental and popular, to eliminate Israel, return to Arab Palestine, and restore Palestine to the entire Arab Nation. * * *

Our valiant Arab army in Arab Jordan and along the front lines: These are your glorious days, as the Arab Nation watches with the hope of delivering Arab Jordan from Husayn's rule and imperialist agents. * * *

Death is the fate of Husayn—the traitor king and hangman of the people. His fate rests in your hands. March toward the royal palaces and purge yourselves of the dynasty of treason to join the revolutionary Arab caravan in its surge toward the great Arab objectives. Allah is great and long live the struggle of the Arab Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would have supposed that our Government, following this particular inflammatory broadcast, would have considered making appropriate representations to the United Arab Republic.

Because I do not believe that the United Arab Republic can claim indifference or lack of knowledge or more particularly lack of responsibility for this radio station within its territory—I refrained on the floor of the House from talking in the hopes that such representations had been made; that they would have been heeded; and that the radios in the Near East would have been less inflammatory. But I regret to report to the House that the radio warfare has continued.

On the 25th of April 1963, this same station, Voice of the Arab Nation, broadcast in Arabic to the Middle East:

Free officers and soldiers in the Jordanian Army: The time has come to liberate Jordan from Husayn. * * * Bedouin officers and soldiers: How long will some of you continue to be deceived by the falsehoods uttered by Husayn? * * * Bedouin soldiers you must realize that Israel will not dare fire one shot on the Jordanian borders after the strong Arab state declared that if Israel does so it will meet its fate in hours. * * * You are capable of crushing all the traitors in Amman in a few hours. After that Israel will not stay on one inch of our holy land.

I could go on and read a number of additional ones including a broadcast on the 29th of April from Cairo MENA in Arabic to the Middle East, which pointed out that "leaflets are still being circulated in Jordanian towns and within the various army units, urging them to support the revolution and to overthrow the collapsing throne of Husayn."

And just on May 1 the Voice of the Arab Nation, broadcast:

Husayn, the 900,000 Palestinian refugees on the western bank will tear you to pieces and each of them will take a piece of your rotten body and throw it in the face of Israel to repay the Jews for the price of treason which your grandfather Abdullah received for Palestine. Indeed Husayn you will go first and the Saudi throne will follow.

And in another broadcast on May 1, 1963, this same station said in Arabic:

Let the bullets whiz; let the guns roar and declare a raging revolution. Masses of our people: Voice the cries of the revolution and rush to the guns with hearts which are not afraid to die. Our masses: March and take the Nablus mountains as the headquarters of your revolution; the Jerusalem hills as your battlefield. Brothers on the borders, in Ramtha and Irbid: Take up your arms, heedless of the curfew or their martial law. Our people want it to be a violent, popular revolution. * *

Our brothers in Jordan: from the Voice of the Arab Nation, we call upon you to look to Palestine whose mountains, Carmel, orchards, and yellow sands are calling you. Look to our Palestine and surge with your revolution. Husayn: You shall see our masses on the hilltops and plateaus untroubled by your guns or the planes of the English and not afraid of the movements of the 6th Fleet or the 10th Fleet. We are carrying on and we are confident that your life will be a short one. As for your traitors, members of the cabinet, we have an account to settle with you. You will either resign

or meet your fate shortly. It will be a black fate.

There are other excerpts that could be quoted from radio Baghdad, from radio Cairo, from radio Damascus, but I shall not presume on the time of the House to do so.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. It is true, is it not, that the gentleman from New York for many years was in this area as Ambassador to Israel?

Mr. REID of New York. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARRY. And that was in the years 1959 to 1961?

Mr. REID of New York. 1959 to 1961.

Mr. BARRY. During that time the gentleman made a constant study of the situation in the Near East and associated that study with travel to these various areas; is not that true?

Mr. REID of New York. I tried to study the situation as much as I could and visited Amman and Beirut.

Mr. BARRY. After the gentleman left that post, with the change of administration, he continued to act in behalf of the people of the Near East.

Mr. REID of New York. I have long believed that the United States should do everything possible to contribute to peace in the Near East. I think this requires a skillful and creative diplomacy. I have talked with regard to the need to develop peace in the Near East and I think that there is an opportunity for this to become a reality; and conversely I have tried to indicate that the situation, in the absence of a clear and affirmative policy could gradually deteriorate and we could be faced with serious hostilities; that the situation could become sensitive, as I believe it is now.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman was a member of the Atlantic Council.

Mr. REID of New York. Yes, I am presently a member of the Atlantic Council; that is true.

Mr. BARRY. The perimeter of that is certainly in that direction.

Mr. REID of New York. The Council is essentially concerned with Atlantic unity, but it is obviously concerned with anything that touches on maintaining peace.

Mr. BARRY. We cannot maintain peace for the Atlantic nations unless we do have peace in the Near East?

Mr. REID of New York. I think the point the gentleman is making is quite obvious. If the situation deteriorates in the Near East, a number of governments could be drawn into it. There is presently the possibility of 300,000 to 500,000 men being under arms in that area in a relatively short time. This I think could constitute a danger to peace that would affect the entire world.

Mr. BARRY. I think the gentleman has made a fine contribution, in introducing this resolution today and I fully support him in this demonstration of U.S. intentions. This is within the field of his experience. We in the Congress need today to take greater interest in

the field of foreign policy and act affirmatively. I thank the gentleman for taking this time and I hope the House will act favorably on this resolution.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. Does the gentleman agree that the administration does not have a clearly defined policy for the Middle East at the present time?

Mr. REID of New York. I think there is a clear need to have a clearer policy and a policy that is more affirmatively stated; hence the pertinency, I hope, of a concurrent resolution today.

Mr. MORSE. Did the gentleman happen to read the column in the Washington Post on Saturday, May 4, by Eldon Griffiths, the distinguished commentator on international affairs, in which he describes the lack of a coherent policy for the Middle East?

Mr. REID of New York. I have had the article called to my attention.

Mr. MORSE. With the gentleman's permission I should like to read a couple of paragraphs from this article.

It is clear that American diplomacy cannot make up its mind what to do about the Middle East. Returning to Washington last weekend, one of the shrewdest operators the United States has ever stationed in the Arab lands, confided his opinion that American policy in the area is in an unholy mess.

Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. REID of New York. I feel that the policy is far from ideal. I think the test of a policy is whether we are moving toward peace or toward war. I think the situation today clearly shows a deteriorating situation in the Near East, the attempt of several countries in that area indirectly to utilize what appears to be outside intervention hoping for the overthrow of one or more legitimate governments. Should this occur, should something happen to the legitimate Government of Saudi Arabia or, particularly, Jordan, this would be a matter of very pressing, serious concern to Israel. I believe our commitments to Israel are clear and must be fully maintained. There should be no doubt on the part of any country in the Near East that we would respond very promptly to any threat to peace.

Mr. MORSE. Has the gentleman from New York as yet submitted his resolution?

Mr. REID of New York. No, I have not as yet read the resolution. Perhaps it will be pertinent to do so at this point in the proceedings.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Could the distinguished gentleman from New York tell me approximately the amount of U.S. aid that has gone to Israel in the years past?

Mr. REID of New York. Approximately \$800 million; something in excess of that.

Mr. STINSON. It seems extremely inconsistent to me that this year we are in the process of phasing out our foreign aid to Israel but at the same time in the process of building up our foreign aid program to Nasser and the United Arab Republic. If I am not mistaken, I believe we are going to give Colonel Nasser this year approximately \$220 million of the American taxpayers' money. This is a rather strange situation. It seems inconsistent with our policy of the past of helping to build up Israel that now we appear to be in the process of building up the United Arab Republic so that they can carry on aggression against Israel and other Near East countries. I think we would be extremely naive if we came to the conclusion that this \$220 million that we are giving to Mr. Nasser is not going to end up, indirectly, perhaps, paying for some Communist-manufactured arms.

We are well aware of the fact that Mr. Nasser is getting most of his armaments from the Communist governments. He has to pay for them through some process. Whenever we put our foreign aid money into Mr. Nasser's treasury, this releases some of his funds to buy these Communist arms. I think this is wrong. I think we should make it very evident to Mr. Nasser that we are not going to tolerate any kind of aggressive act on his part. We should either demand that Nasser stop his military buildup or withdraw our foreign aid from him.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I believe they do have a measure of relevance, particularly if the Government of the United Arab Republic and the President of the United Arab Republic do not respect the right of freedom of transit in the Suez Canal and do not respect the six principles adopted unanimously by the Security Council on October 13, 1956, with regard to free and open transit through the canal and, particularly as the Government of the United Arab Republic directly or indirectly may be taking responsibility for certain of the actions as represented in radio broadcasts. I would also refer to the story in the Los Angeles Times datelined Algiers on May 4 which deals with "Nasser Gets Big Algiers Welcome. Ben Bella Talks of Joining United Arab Republic." The report from Algiers by Don Shannon said this:

The crowd, reduced by a thunderstorm that delayed the rally an hour, booted lustily when both Ben Bella and Nasser declared Israel their common enemy.

Clearly, any nation that is a member of the U.N. must uphold, in my opinion, the principles of the charter and the principles of the charter do not condone continuing belligerency or continuing in a state of war or apparent state of war. Therefore, to the extent that this Government—the United Arab Republic—does not wish to live within the precepts and principles of the charter of the United Nations, I believe that is a matter for concern of the Congress and the President of the United States.

I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this matter before the House. I think also it should be underscored, as was done earlier, that the gentleman in bringing this matter to the floor brings a great deal of personal experience not only because he has served as Ambassador to Israel, but also in view of the fact that he has done a great deal of work and has devoted himself personally to these problems. I think it is very important for the Congress to have men who can lead the way and point the way not only for the Congress, but for America in setting forth these problems with which we are involved from day to day in our life, as we know it.

I think it is also important, first, to recognize that this is a very sensitive area. Sometimes I think we overlook the sensitivity of the Middle East and the problems that are involved there. I think in view of the fact that the gentleman was Ambassador for some 2 years to Israel, certainly, he can give us the benefit of the knowledge which he has acquired as a result of that service and his contact with the heads of the government in this area. I think it is a sensitive area today, particularly in view of this compact that has been executed. I think it is very important that America, as the gentleman stated earlier, take a very clear position in advance of something happening. We do not want something to happen and then to have America react to the situation as it may exist at that time. I think it is also important for us to recognize that America has many interests in this area, particularly in Israel, a country that has been free and a country that is one of the freedom-loving countries in the world today, represented by people who are doing their best to promote freedom in the world. I think it is very important for us as Americans to let the people in Israel know that we are going to stand in back of them and that we are concerned over what happens in that area. It is important for the Congress and the executive branch of the Government to speak as one and to make clear our American policy.

That policy should be we will not tolerate any interference with sovereign nations in that area.

I want to associate myself with the gentleman from New York in the resolution that he will present a little bit later and say I subscribe to that wholeheartedly. I have had the opportunity of reading the resolution and consulting with the gentleman before he took the floor of the House, and I subscribe in toto to the proposals he is presenting in this resolution.

In closing, I would like to say it is very important for us to let the people in that part of the world know that America will not tolerate aggression, and that we are going to protect and we will stand behind the country of Israel, and we will not permit any aggression against them and against their country.

So I want to again commend the gentleman for bringing this to the floor and pointing out the problems that exist, and suggest that this Government take a very firm and strong position at this time before something can happen which would indicate, what the gentleman has presented the inflammatory remarks made by radio and otherwise, that this situation could result in a very difficult proposition within a matter of hours.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from New York for his remarks here today, particularly in view of his wide experience in this field and on this subject. I think all of us in the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, can benefit from his observations because of the firsthand experience the gentleman has had in dealing with this problem as U.S. Ambassador to Israel.

I am particularly impressed with the observation the gentleman made that this is a difficult problem, not one of easy solution. Statements have been made that we ought to have a definite and firm policy. I am under the impression that our Government—the U.S. Government—from the very day that Israel was formally established, has been unequivocally on record that we will not tolerate any diminution of the liberties and sovereignty of that great democracy in the Middle East. I do not know of any change that has occurred over the last 15 years under either administration, Democratic or Republican, which would in any way alter our basic fundamental, unequivocal position that this Nation will not tolerate any interference with the basic freedom, territorial rights, boundaries, and sovereignty of Israel.

I would like to ask the gentleman, Has there been any appreciable or substantive change in that position, or am I correct in understanding that we are today as firmly committed as ever to the fact that we will not tolerate any action which would in any way hamper or endanger the sovereignty of Israel?

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I will try to respond to his question, and I think the easiest way to do so is to read the concurrent resolution which I am offering. I would like to say at the outset I am offering this in the broadest bipartisan spirit to reemphasize and clarify that it is a policy which started in the Truman administration and has been continued under the Eisenhower administration, and now under the present administration. I do feel, however, there are certain developments that have occurred, particularly the possibility of outside intervention with regard to the Government of Jordan and the Government of Saudi Arabia which could be sensitive and which could prompt a very rapid response from Israel.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, I certainly would like to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this resolution before the House. I think any action taken at this time to reaffirm the fundamental determination of this country that we are not going to tolerate interference with the sovereignty of Israel serves both the best interests of the United States and peace in the world.

I am sure many of us on this side would join in supporting any effort in that direction, as last year many Members on the other side joined in our similar action.

Since the gentleman has had this wide experience in this particular field, I am particularly grateful that he has taken the time today to tell us about the damaging broadcasts which certainly must be curtailed, and to give us the benefit of his experience and knowledge on this subject. I would like to hear the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in reply to the gentleman's last remark I just want to make it clear that the thing I was speaking about, which the gentleman just presented is that it is important, as I see it, because of the sensitiveness in this area, that we reaffirm our policy. And, it seems to me that the time has come, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] has indicated, for us to reaffirm and that the Congress, with bipartisan support, should, along with the Executive, indicate to the people in the Middle East exactly what the position of the United States is today so that there can be no question about it, and I would be hopeful that the clear announcement from this Congress and from the Executive can avert, perhaps, the type of thing that might get out of hand.

Mr. REID of New York. I would like to read the resolution and just one brief statement or two before I yield further, and I would like to recall the statement I made on the House floor on March 12, wherein I said:

The House will recall that the formation on October 23, 1956, of the last joint command of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, with the stated purpose of "the liquidation of Israel" in large measure triggered action by the Government of Israel in Sinai—as Israel believed its security was threatened and that its survival was at stake; thereby requiring action in self defense.

Now we are having the beginning here of a pattern that could cause concern, the initial statement of the desire to form a joint military command. The official statement in the Arab unity proclamation that there would be such a joint military command—although I note that conversations looking to the formation of that command, which were to have started May 13, have been postponed—but nevertheless a clear statement of an intention to form a unified military command and the statement of the purpose, that is, the liberation of the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and

imperialism. This is a pattern, when put alongside of the various radio broadcasts, gives reason for increased concern. It could trigger an action wherein military forces could be involved, and it could quite clearly threaten the security and the integrity of Israel, to which we are committed, and it is against this background that I would like to read this resolution. This is a concurrent resolution:

Whereas on May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a tripartite declaration pledging themselves to prevent the violation of frontiers, or armistice lines in the general area of the Middle East; and

Whereas on April 9, 1956, the United States Government "in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations" declared its intention "within constitutional means to oppose any aggression in the area" and its determination "to support and assist any nation which might be subjected to such aggression"; and

Whereas the Congress, on March 9, 1957, adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence," and to undertake in such area "military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance" against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism, including, in the discretion of the President, the use of United States Armed Forces to assist any such nation or group of nations; and

Whereas the outbreak of armed conflict in the Middle East would be likely to spread to other areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is urged—

to reaffirm the deep interest of the United States Government in the peace and stability of the Middle East area, and in the realization of the legitimate aspirations of all the peoples of the area;

to reiterate the unalterable opposition of the United States Government to the use of force or the threat of force among any of the states in that area, for the purpose of violating or altering frontiers or armistice lines, or for any other purposes which would threaten the peace and stability of the area;

to make clear that the United States Government includes in its definition of such actions, subversive activities of all types undertaken by any state against the established government or governmental institutions of any state in the area, including the use of clandestine agents, the clandestine introduction of arms, and so forth, into any state in the area, or the making, or permitting to be made, of inflammatory statements directed against any state in the area by any other state or by its leaders or recognized spokesmen, or by radio or television from the territory of any other state directed toward the overthrow of the legitimate government of any other state;

to state that the United States Government considers such activities to be violations of both the spirit and the provisions of the United Nations Charter, which the United States Government is committed to uphold; and

to declare the intention of the United States Government, upon the request of any state in the area which considers itself threatened by any such action by or from the territory of any other state, and consistent with its obligations as a member of the

United Nations, immediately to take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation and to preserve the peace and stability of the area.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from New York, whose knowledge and experience in this field is unparalleled by anyone in this body, deserves the congratulations and the thanks of all of us for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area in which the executive has the principal responsibility and to which it must direct its attention. I think that the gentleman's resolution will help focus the administration's attention on a most critical problem. I trust the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the near future and I certainly hope and will do everything in my power to persuade the chairman of that committee to hold hearings on the gentleman's resolution as soon as possible.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like first to draw to the attention of the Members of the House the qualifications of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], to speak on this subject. I do not suppose that the United States has ever in modern times had a more beloved ambassador in a foreign country than was our friend and colleague from New York who was for a number of years Ambassador to the State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, based upon my personal visits to the State of Israel and in talking with knowledgeable men in the field of diplomacy, I know something of the statesmanship that the gentleman brought to this area on behalf of the United States and on behalf of all nations and persons who are concerned with the preservation of stability and peace in that area.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New York brings balanced judgment on this subject too. He is not a crusader in the wrong sense. He is a statesman in the right sense who knows the differences between right and wrong and the difference between principle and expediency.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has performed a service in introducing this resolution in the House of Representatives today and in taking the floor to speak on this subject. There is no question in my own mind but what the executive branch and the Department of State is often assisted by Members of Congress who know what they are talking about and who have had experience in the field speaking honestly and forthrightly on subjects of immediate concern.

Unfortunately, too often the executive branch and the Department of State allows itself to become so torn between various pressures and so ensnared in splits between divisions and levels within itself that it freezes at the control stick. There is a good deal of indecision and ambivalence on the question of what is our policy in the Middle East.

To some extent our policy in the Middle East has been controlled by pragmatic considerations first and foremost. There is some reason for this. Our Government is sensitive to the fact that all of the land in the Middle East is constantly under the probing, searching attack of the giant to the north and east, the Soviet Union. But our Government must understand also that our country has always stood for principle, for freedom and for the independence and individual rights and liberties of all people. And I do not think that there can be any compromise with principle insofar as the integrity of the State of Israel is concerned. We will not see it traded away. Nor can we be a party to a breach of a contract entered into freely, as was done in the case of the tripartite agreement that the gentleman from New York refers to in his talk and his resolution. Nor can there be any misunderstanding about the position of the member nations of the United Nations in this regard. So what the distinguished gentleman from New York has done is to remind Members that there is a contract outstanding which obligates the United States to preserve the integrity of independent nations in the Middle East; and that we are on record in the United Nations to see to it that aggression is not committed by any means or fashion against free peoples and independent nations in that part of the world.

I hope that the gentleman's resolution and the words he has spoken on the floor of the House today will be broadcast far and wide and that they will serve the very useful purpose of getting our friends downtown in the State Department off center; of helping them clarify policy which at the moment is unclear.

I think that it would be a very useful thing if, in response to what the gentleman has stated, the Secretary of State would issue a very clear statement defining what U.S. policy is in the Middle East. They should have no fear of doing this for the very simple reason that, as I said, principle cannot be disregarded and the world will respect a principle fairly and squarely stated.

We will not lose any friends by doing this. We will be preparing for the future by doing it. As the gentleman well knows, in the event there should be some kind of an accident in the Middle East, any kind at all, whether an assassin's bullet should find a target, or whether there should be an explosion in the streets or a rising of some kind, it could set off a chain reaction of the most fearful kind.

It behooves us to plan for this, to be ready for it, to understand that if such a chain reaction should set in, the integrity of free countries, and particularly the integrity of the free nation of Israel would be under dire and severe at-

tack. It would be a convulsion that might engulf the world.

It is not easy to make plans for the future. It is not easy to plan for contingencies, because part of that planning means making decisions and clear policy which is publicly and openly stated. I do not think we have that clear policy today.

I should like to thank our colleague from New York for his remarks today, and for his carefully worded, statesman-like resolution. I am delighted to co-sponsor it with him and am today introducing it alongside of his.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] for his eloquent, pertinent, forceful, and thoughtful remarks, because indeed we do have a contract outstanding, a contract outstanding since the formation of the State of Israel, a contract honored by every President of the United States. I believe it is essential that we do those things, as the gentleman from New York just pointed out, that would represent taking action now before accidents might occur that could set off a conflagration—the implications and the scope of which no Member here today could foresee. The danger, I believe, and I used to talk with former Secretary of State Dulles on this subject, is that frequently when the position of the U.S. Government has become unclear, it is not because documents have not been clear but because our willingness to act has been questioned. Secretary Dulles felt the greatest danger in foreign relations is miscalculation of the intentions of any state and particularly those of the most powerful state in the world today—the United States. Hence, we have an obligation to make crystal clear the main elements and intentions of our foreign policy and our willingness to act in accordance with these policies.

I think we have a situation in the Near East today where we have something that we can honor. We can honor peaceful relations with peaceful nations in the area. We can honor the integrity of Israel. We believe deeply in this. The relations between the United States and Israel are basic in the free world. But we would not be honoring that if at this juncture, in the light of the statements our Government has already made in the diplomatic channels, the United States did not speak more clearly at the same time and with one voice.

It would be my hope that at this time we approve a bipartisan resolution that would express the will of the Congress, of the American people, and of the Government. It is my belief that in so doing, were this Congress so to act, the President could reaffirm that this resolution would be understood by those who appreciate human liberty and human dignity, and by all who oppose outside intervention. Our purpose must be to see that peace in our time is a reality, and to do those things that would keep the peace before any dangers can come along that would disturb the peace and would violate the border or territory of any country in the area, and quite obviously

and most particularly Israel in this instance.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for reading the resolution. It certainly answers all the questions that have been raised here earlier.

I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], that it is important for the legislative branch of the Government to reaffirm these principles. This resolution certainly does set out the position that has been stated by President Roosevelt, by President Truman, by President Eisenhower, and, yes, frequently, by President Kennedy. It also reaffirms what Mr. Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has said repeatedly in the United Nations. It is my hope we will be able to join together in getting this resolution approved so that the legislative branch of the Government can serve notice on those who would violate peace in the Near East.

As the gentleman said earlier in his remarks, the language of the military agreement signed by the Arab States should be most disturbing to all of us who are determined to preserve a just peace in the Middle East.

Therefore, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for bringing the resolution to this body today. It is my hope it will get joint bipartisan support. It will certainly help President Kennedy make it clear to those in the Middle East what our intentions have been and what they are now, and that is that we unequivocally stand behind the principle that the sovereignty of Israel must not be violated. So I congratulate the gentleman for bringing to this Chamber his great experience and wisdom, and I am particularly grateful to him for bringing this matter to our attention because of the experience he has had in this area.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is my very earnest hope that it would be possible not only to have a bipartisan resolution passed by the Congress, but for the President to speak so that the United States will speak with one voice. I think this is a situation where clearly there are enough indications on the record to cause concern. There reportedly have been representations by our Government that have not been wholly heeded by some of the governments in the area. I would think that the Congress speaking as one voice and the President speaking with the Congress would in no uncertain terms indicate our clear determination to preserve the peace and to oppose aggression and to do those things that would further the legitimate aspirations of peoples of the area for life and liberty and human dignity and which would preserve our desire to have friendly relations with all nations in the Near East and to have a clear relationship that would protect the sovereignty and integrity and security of the State of Israel.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the gentleman for a very thoughtful and provocative presentation today. I, too, share the gentleman's concern over the recent developments in the Near East. I am not sure how often the legislative branch of our Government is able to speak with one voice, but I do think it is entirely appropriate and timely that the Congress at this time do take a look at the situation and, perhaps, come up with a resolution of the kind the gentleman is proposing. I want to congratulate the gentleman for the discussion he has made here today.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would only like to add in conclusion, before yielding the floor, that I think the United States bears a particular and special responsibility. As the leader of the free world we have an opportunity to creatively work with all the nations in the Near East so that peace becomes a true reality. It has been my observation that unless we speak clearly, unless our foreign policy is based on respect and unless the foundation and the heart and mind of our foreign policy is clearly understood then we may have friends but not respect. It is only when we speak firmly and clearly and with one voice that the United States can be truly effective and can be said to have a truly effective foreign policy.

So it is my hope that the Congress will take note of the events that have occurred in the Near East and the formulation of the referendum leading to a tripartite United Arab Republic with Egypt, Syria, and Iraq and the full statement in the Arab unity proclamation which states without any question that a unified military command is being established and I quote:

For the establishment of a military unity capable of liberating the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and imperialism.

I would hope that that would register clearly on the U.S. Government. I would hope we would take more urgent measures to deal with the radio warfare that is going on that is inflammatory and I hope, above all, we will do everything possible to work out peaceful relations with all the states in the area, to respect the close relations that we have with Israel and the commitments we have with regard to the integrity and sovereignty of Israel and to see to it that through the announcement of such a concurrent resolution and its passage by the Congress and a restatement of these matters by the President that nothing will happen in the Near East that will seriously disturb the peace and threaten Israel or bring on hostilities that could lead to a very serious conflagration and to a major war.

It is my belief that this resolution and the action of the Congress can here today and in the days ahead make a significant contribution to the cause of peace.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have received expressions of grave con-

cern regarding the security of Israel in the face of the latest alliances and consolidations in the Near East today. This is a matter which, I believe, should be of concern to us all, for Israel is one of our most trusted friends in that strategic area. For this reason, I should like to include for the RECORD my remarks to the members of the Connecticut Zionist Region on this timely subject.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks follow:

FOR THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL IN THE NEAR EAST TODAY

I am grateful for your invitation to express my views regarding the importance to the United States of the security of Israel in view of the turbulent conditions in the Near East today. May I take this opportunity to extend my greetings and best wishes to all of you on the occasion of the Annual Midyear Conference of the Connecticut Zionist Region. This matter is such an important one to the people of the Nation as well as to those of Connecticut, that I have requested that these remarks be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 6, 1963.

The United States has traditionally expressed its sympathetic understanding of the yearnings of the Jewish people for a restoration of their homeland. This expression has gone far beyond moral support alone and taken the form of direct financial, cultural, economic and technical cooperation. It is presently embodied in more than 47 treaties with amendments and extensions between the two nations. Ranging all the way from agricultural commodities and atomic energy to defense and mutual security to a treaty of friendship in trade and commerce. The ties between the United States and Israel are firmly forged and I hope and trust that as the years go by, they will grow even stronger.

Conditions in the Near East today are a cause of serious concern to the United States. The spirit of nationalism of the Near Eastern peoples, compressed by centuries of frustration, has finally sprung with an almost unbridled passion upon a world divided by two bitterly antagonistic ideologies. More than a rivalry between East and West, this conflict is a four-dimensional war for annihilation, not restricted to men or nations, but for the annihilation of the entire Judeo-Christian civilization itself. To rip its very roots from the minds and hearts of our peoples.

It is being waged at every level with all the might of the most fearsome barbarism, oriented in atheism, that the modern world has ever seen. By persuasive control of the minds of the simple and unsuspecting, by the threat of force and the use of naked brutality upon the weaker peoples who oppose; and by subversion and the fermentation of civil strife within the nations of those strong enough to resist. By sociological and economic warfare upon the whole world outside of the Communist conspiracy, they are determined to divide and conquer. This is one of the most vicious onslaughts of a combined ethnic and ideological imperialism in recorded history. Worse even than the overt Nazi German nationalism, this is a conquest by subterfuge, propounded as being purely ideological rather than the Sino-Russian Communist aggression that it is.

The United States leads the nations of the West and the free world against this darkness today. Nurtured in Jewish and Near Eastern culture, the Western nations grew after many centuries of costly trial and error through the age of the enlightenment to the dawn of a bright and hopeful era when they declared, after World War II, their dedication to keeping the world safe for democracy; and security and self-determination for

the peoples of every nation in the preservation of their ethnic cultures and social and economic ways of life.

While the foregoing would seem to belabor the obvious, I stress it by repetition here, because it was within the context of this portentous confrontation that the new State of Israel emerged and struggled for existence today. It is within this context that the new nationalism of the Near East is developing. And because of which there are indeed grave implications for all concerned. But the State of Israel has proven herself to be a faithful and trustworthy friend to our cause despite the difficult conditions with which she is surrounded. She has withstood the threats of Soviet Russia despite her tiny size. And, unlike some of those who would imperil her, she has not tried her hand at the dangerous game of trying to play both sides for advantage in the cold war. Let me assure you that this country's vows of lasting friendship and support for the independence of Israel, as of all States of the Near East, is inherent in our policies. We have repeatedly made clear our concern for Israel's security. We have adopted this policy faithfully, leaving no doubts about our position. And I hereby pledge my full support to the continuation of that policy, and will do all in my power to urge my colleagues in the Congress to the support of that policy.

We cannot but deplore the sad condition and plight of the Jews inside Russia today. We are all familiar with the continuing reports of their oppression and religious curtailment at the hands of the Communists. From all indications these outrages are increasing rather than decreasing. We can only hope that that unbreakable faith and inner courage which led the Jews through centuries of persecution and even through the death camps of Nazi Germany will somehow preserve them now, through these new tribulations.

And we are all well aware that should this sinister plague spread to and engulf the lands wherein other Asian Jews live, they, too, would fare no better. And we are dedicated as well to the preservation of the independence of those Asian countries.

This transcendent conflict underlies, I believe, the realities of life today, both for Israel and the United States, and Jews everywhere. And so it is urgent for us all to understand our common purpose with our staunch friend in the Near East and maintain that unity of strength and purpose. For anything that tends to divide, weaken, or undermine our inner strength in these particularly perilous times, whether at internal issues or international zones of contact, tends to gnaw away at the very keystone of the ramparts of Judeo-Christian civilization today. If this mighty dam should ever be weakened and so give way; in the deluge that would follow, there can be little doubt, there would be no return for us to civilization as we know and enjoy it today, ever. For upon Jews and Christians everywhere alike, the bondage of an alien tyranny would fall so heavily that the realization of the message of the Passover would lay many centuries hence in a very dark and uncertain future. With the help of God, we are joined and pledged that this shall not happen. And I am sure that it will not.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask that any Member who participated in the debate may have 5 legislative days in which to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include material relevant to the resolution I have introduced and to the subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM RIDERS' BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the increasing strength of the civil rights movement and the gains which have been achieved in many areas are the result in large measure of the courage and dedication of private individuals and organizations which are willing to fight for civil rights with direct nonviolent action. Freedom rides, freedom walks, sit-ins, boycotts, and peaceful picketing are expressions of protest against the persistent evils of segregation and discrimination.

There are many examples. Freedom riders suffered violence and jail sentences before the Interstate Commerce Commission promulgated regulations banning racial discrimination in interstate terminal facilities. Sit-ins have continued to face violence and arrest in their efforts to desegregate chain stores and restaurants. And in Mississippi, a concerted voter registration drive is being conducted by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, acting together.

In all of these activities civil rights workers are constantly subjected to the danger of arrest and conviction. Negroes, who have participated in the Mississippi registration drive, have been arrested on various charges ranging from having a car painted the wrong color to bigamy—*Washington Post*, September 10, 1962, page A10. For daring to uphold the Constitution individuals have been arrested on the grounds of "trespass," "breach of the peace," and "criminal anarchy." Although the Supreme Court has reversed convictions in cases of this nature, the stigma of arrest still remains. Of course, because of the expense involved, not every case can be appealed to the Supreme Court. Appeals take a long time. Today there are almost 3,000 Negro and white student sit-ins, who demonstrated peacefully against segregated cafeterias and restaurants in the South as long ago as the spring of 1960, whose cases are still pending in the courts.

It is sad testimony to our success in fulfilling the noble goals of our democracy that Americans who strive to uphold the Constitution are penalized. These citizens are acting in the best interests and traditions of our country and deserve our highest praise and encouragement.

To protect our citizens who are engaged in the civil rights movement I have again introduced a bill which provides:

Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, no person shall be denied any license, right, benefit, or privilege under any

law of the United States, or incur any other disability or disqualification under any such law, or be denied the right of employment by the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or, if so employed, be subject to dismissal, solely because of his participation in any peaceful demonstration or other peaceful activity, the object of which is to achieve equal rights for all persons regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin or to resist discriminatory treatment and segregation in any public facility or place of public accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate consideration of this measure and hope that it will receive a favorable response by the Congress.

DEFENSE AGREEMENT WITH ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution urging the President to invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nation to join with this country in a collective defense agreement with Israel.

This resolution in effect is a restatement of the principles of the tripartite agreement entered into between England, France and the United States; and the mere restatement by the President at this time of that resolution to the effect that it is still the policy of this Government should dispel the fears of Israel as to possible acts of aggression on the part of its Arab neighbors.

Following is the text of the resolution:

Whereas, on May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a three-party declaration pledging themselves to hold inviolate the borders between Israel and the Arab States and to assure and guarantee those borders;

Whereas the Congress, on March 9, 1957, adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence," and to undertake in such area military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations desiring such assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism;

Whereas the outbreak of armed conflict in the Middle East would be likely to spread to other areas;

Whereas recent events in the Middle East, including an arms buildup by the Arab States with the encouragement and support of the Soviet Union, constitute a serious threat to international peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is urged to invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nations to join with the United States in a collective defense agreement with Israel, and any other Middle East State which is willing to join and carry out its obligations under such an agreement, and to provide such military and other assistance and cooperation as may be necessary to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation in the Middle East which is a party to the agreement against armed attack by any other nation.

A collective defense agreement with Israel and any other country which will accept these recommendations should go far in strengthening the cause of international peace and make this a better world for future generations of all nations.

THE MORE REHABILITATION THE LESS PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, I introduced into the Congress H.R. 4027, entitled the "Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1963." The general purpose of this bill is to expand and improve the vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the country. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings on the legislation have not been announced.

When the Labor-HEW appropriations bill was being considered on the floor of the House last week, I called attention to the fact that over 100,000 handicapped individuals were rehabilitated into employment through the State-Federal program of rehabilitation in 1962. It is estimated that the number will rise to 125,000 for the 1964 fiscal year. We have been encouraged by the fact that State legislatures are recognizing the potentialities of vocational rehabilitation by appropriating ever increasing sums to match the Federal funds available for vocational rehabilitation services. With alert and efficient administration at both the Federal and State levels, this program offers one of the best examples we have of a truly effective Federal-State partnership in the provision of an essential service to our citizens.

Significant as the progress has been in recent years, it remains a tragic fact that not over one-third of the handicapped individuals needing rehabilitation services in any given year are being served. There are a number of reasons for this. The program is still not well enough known to the general public. Physicians and others who have first access to handicapped individuals are slow to recognize the potentials of vocational rehabilitation for the restoration of their patients or clients to maximum usefulness in their communities. Some of the problems are legal, and it is to correct some of the legal inadequacies that I introduced H.R. 4027.

The rigid requirement that handicapped individuals are not eligible to receive rehabilitation service unless there is a reasonable expectation that they may become employable serves as a barrier to the acceptance of many of the most severely handicapped individuals. In the bill I introduced, it is provided that the State rehabilitation agencies, with the use of Federal funds, may provide any rehabilitation services up to 18 months for the mentally retarded and up to 6 months for any other groups during which time rehabilitation potential is being determined. This will have the practical effect of enabling State rehabilitation

agencies which now feel the necessity of passing judgment upon the employability of applicants very early in their contact with the agency to expend more time and more money in making this important determination. It has been demonstrated time after time that, in the case of many severely handicapped individuals, particularly the mentally retarded, it is impossible to pass judgment on the employability of such individuals until they have been given an opportunity over an extended period of time.

In another section of the bill, provision is made for Federal assistance to the States to help them establish rehabilitation facilities, including workshops for the very severely disabled. It has been thoroughly demonstrated that many of the most severely disabled people, including the mentally retarded, must have a transitional experience of work before they can be expected to compete with others in open employment. Under this legislation, we hope to construct the specific types of vocational rehabilitation facilities which will help obtain this objective.

In other sections of the bill, it is provided that private funds may be used to match Federal funds for the construction of rehabilitation facilities under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. In still another section, it is provided that local taxing units may participate in the program by financing rehabilitation services above the State level for their own communities. Both of these provisions will result in far greater general local community activity in the rehabilitation field.

The improvement and expansion of rehabilitation services, while primarily developed for the benefits such services can be to individual handicapped persons, is clearly in the national interest. The more rehabilitation we have the less dependency we have. The less dependency we have the less call for public assistance in other forms of relief. Every year we delay the needed reforms in vocational rehabilitation legislation, we are losing ground that can never be regained. It has been a disappointment to me that 4 months of this session have passed without hearings on this legislation being announced. In the light of comprehensive hearings conducted by the House Committee on Education and Labor during the previous Congress, it is felt that a minimum of hearings will be necessary in order to report a good bill. We sincerely hope that committee action will come before long and that a bill can be passed by the House of Representatives and accepted by the Senate during this session.

WE HAD BETTER CHANGE OUR STRATEGY FOR THE UPCOMING TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the Kennedy round-of-trade negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The negotiations start with a ministerial meeting of the 44 countries of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva on May 16.

Already, we who believe in the principle of an expanding free world trade open to all have been disappointed at the course of the Trade Expansion Act. The act was designed to permit down-to-zero bargaining on many of the major groups of commodities produced in the leading industrial countries. Second, it was designed to get into operation fast, so as to provide the maximum help for our lagging employment and growth, and for our chronically imbalanced international payments. Third, it was designed to aid all the countries of the free world on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis.

As I have pointed out many times, our State Department's obsession with the Common Market at the expense of the rest of the free world has prevented our attaining the first two objectives.

ZERO BARGAINING FALLS BY THE WAYSIDE

The clause of the Trade Expansion Act allowing down-to-zero bargaining was conditioned on Britain's joining the Common Market. With Britain and other members of the European Free Trade Association in the Common Market, the down-to-zero clause would have affected some 26 major commodity groups. Without them in the Common Market, the clause evaporates into thin air, since with one or two exceptions there are simply no commodity groups which qualify. With Britain out by De Gaulle's veto of last January 14, the zero-bargaining clause of the Trade Expansion Act has become a nullity. Through using the Trade Expansion Act as a bludgeon to obtain British entry into the Common Market, we have rendered useless the principal bargaining power of the act.

The same distortion of emphasis has resulted in a lamentable slowdown in carrying out the act. The act became law in October 1962. Had we started the day after the act was signed to go through its procedural exercises, we would have been ready to negotiate today. Instead, we waited, hoping against hope that Britain would join the Common Market. As a result, we are only now pulling ourselves together, and it looks as if negotiations cannot even start until about this time in 1964—at least a year later.

"IF THE COMMON MARKET WON'T PLAY, ALL IS LOST"

Now our Common Market fixation is about to lead us into a third and most distressing distortion of the Trade Expansion Act. The act, as I have said, was designed to enable us to bargain down tariffs not just with the Six of the Common Market—to whom we sell one-fifth of our exports, some \$4 billion annually—but with the whole free world membership of the rest of GATT—to

whom we sell four-fifths of our exports, some \$16 billion annually.

But our apparent policy for the upcoming preliminary GATT meeting in Geneva is to say, "We are going to negotiate mainly with the Common Market; and if the Common Market proves difficult, we are going to punish ourselves and the rest of the free world by calling off the whole negotiations."

"If the Common Market won't play, all is lost" appears to be the U.S. official bargaining attitude. If the Common Market sticks to its proposed protective farm policy on wheat, corn, feed grains, rice, and poultry; or if it refuses to make adequate concessions to the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark, and the other countries hurt by its farm policy; or if it refuses to bargain in good faith by substantially lowering tariffs on industrial products—if any of these things happen, we will end the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, and leave ourselves and the rest of the free world high and dry. No use bargaining with the rest of the 44-member GATT, so the argument runs, because tariffs lowered by such bargaining would simply result in the unjust enrichment of the Common Market through most-favored-nation treatment.

OUR PRESENT BARGAINING STRATEGY

This bargaining strategy has been extensively reported in the press recently.

For example, on April 29, 1963, Special Trade Negotiator Christian A. Herter told the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that the United States would end the Kennedy round unless the Common Market rids itself of its agricultural protectionism.

Before we engage in far-ranging tariff reductions on industrial products—

Said Mr. Herter—

we feel that we must have indications that the Common Market is not adopting a restrictive trade policy on agriculture.

The press has for some weeks been saying the same thing.

March 21, 1963, Associated Press story from Washington:

Perhaps the greatest U.S. apprehension * * * is the possibility that France and perhaps one or more of the other market nations may insist on exempting their farm products from tariff cuts to protect their agricultural economies. In such a case, Washington sources said, the United States would be extremely reluctant to bargain for tariff reductions on industrial goods. The clear implication was that a protectionist stand by President de Gaulle on agricultural commodities might bring GATT talks to a premature stalemate.

March 29, 1963, Paul Cremona, correspondent in Geneva, reporting to the Christian Science Monitor:

In the Kennedy round [the Americans] add, industrial tariff cuts can only be negotiated after the agricultural issue has been cleared up.

April 1, 1963, comment in U.S. News & World Report:

New round of GATT sessions won't get off the ground, U.S. officials warn, if the six Common Market nations retain stiff farm-import curbs. United States, in the past,

has been willing to pass over the touchy agriculture issue. But now farm tariffs will have to be put on the bargaining table. The position to be taken by U.S. negotiators: No bargaining by you on agriculture, no bargaining by us on industrial products.

April 13, 1963, article on "Getting Set for Kennedy Round," *Business Week*:

Washington's hope is that enough will be known about EEC's farm policy and the feasibility of global commodity agreements by next year, so that the United States can go ahead with the bargaining on industrial tariffs. * * * The French Government is telling its partners in EEC that it will refuse to have farm products included in the Kennedy round unless real progress is made first on the common agricultural policy. With EEC's farm program as badly bogged down as it is today, this almost amounts to a French veto of the Kennedy round in advance.

April 28, 1963, *New York Times* article by Brendan M. Jones:

Should the Common Market be willing to negotiate only a limited number of tariff reductions with this country in the coming discussions an awkward problem would arise. The effect would be to stymie special negotiations with Britain or Japan, for example.

Tariff cuts made to either of these countries would, under most-favored-nation policy, have to be extended to the Common Market. Thus, the Common Market would gain the benefit of an extra tariff concession without making a compensating one of its own to this country.

Such unrequited benefits to the Common Market would go very much against the grain for the United States, especially after limited bargaining by the European bloc. It is probable they would also limit new agreements with other countries.

Consequently, the negotiations with the Common Market are being approached by administration officials as the key to a general lowering of world trade barriers.

To recapitulate, then, our bargaining strategy seems to be this: Bargain only with the Common Market; and if the Common Market will not give on either agricultural or industrial products, end the ball game.

THE COMMON MARKET'S POSITION

What makes our bargaining position a strategy headed for almost certain failure is that the conditions of failure—Common Market intransigence—are highly likely to come to pass. True, a number of members of the Six undoubtedly want to be reasonable about the upcoming negotiations. But any one member can transform the Six into an unreasonable roadblock. France proved that by its January 14 veto of Britain's entry.

The blunt fact is that strong elements exist in the Common Market which are quite content with its proposed agricultural protectionism.

Strong elements exist also which find its relatively high external tariff on industrial goods, coupled with the increasingly free exchange of goods between members of the Six, an economic advantage beyond compare. Here are six mighty industrial countries of Europe, invited to form a bloc which gives them a tremendous internal market, and the right to discriminate in their tariffs against the rest of the world—all with the cheers of the free world ringing in their ears. Who would not be happy at being granted a special license to discriminate, while at the same time receiving the applause of those discriminated against?

So the likelihood of intransigence by the Six is very real. A discerning article in the *Economist* for April 13, 1963,

discusses the French attitude toward tariff reductions:

Not only would a massive incursion of American goods menace several French industries; too radical a reduction in the common external tariff of the Six would jeopardize the cohesion of the Common Market. Paris has not gone to so much trouble to exclude Britain only to let in the United States by the back door. Wholesale concessions to the United States would also be detrimental to the agricultural policy of the Six, as well as to their relations with Africa; this, in the eyes of Paris, weighs as heavily as the threat to France's metallurgical, chemical, coal, and textile industries.

French industrialists go even further than the Government and * * * in their view a straightforward application of the same rules to the enormous American trusts and to even the largest European undertakings resembles a struggle between a mouse and an elephant * * * "How can there be real competition with General Motors?" M. Villiers, president of the French employers, recently asked "so long as its enormous powers, its fabulous capital resources, its considerable profits, enable it to have recourse to a range of marketing and publicity techniques unattainable in Europe?" According to the industrialists, true equality would therefore demand concessions from the United States double or treble those required of Europe.

All this is a gloomy prospect. If the Common Market is intransigent, if the Six says "Stop the world, we want to get off," we are apparently about to punish ourselves and the rest of the free world by calling off the negotiations for expanding trade then and there.

NEED FOR A NEW STRATEGY

Mr. Speaker, this need not be. We should jettison our apparent present strategy, and instead adopt a strategy directed at the whole free world, rather than one in which the Common Market can all by itself call the tune.

Specifically, we should announce at Geneva on May 16 that we hope that the Common Market will join us at the negotiations in working for restrictions on agricultural and industrial products that are low, low, low, and that apply on a nondiscriminatory basis through the whole free world. Better still, the administration should announce its intention of asking Congress to amend the Trade Expansion Act, so as to permit down-to-zero bargaining rather than the 50-percent tariff cuts permissible under the act as it now stands.

But, above all, we should make clear to the Common Market right at the start that our aim is free worldwide tariff bargaining, with the help of the Common Market, if we can; without it if we must.

All is not lost. We are by no means helpless if the Common Market decides on intransigence at Geneva, either now or late in the negotiating game, as in the case of the veto of Britain. We have some excellent legal weapons, and we would be poor bargainers indeed if we failed to point out what they are:

AGRICULTURAL PROTECTIONISM

First. Possible action against protectionism on agricultural products.

The Common Market is in the process of adopting a protectionist policy on wheat, corn, feed grains, rice, and poul-

try. We exported \$483 million of these to the Common Market in fiscal 1962, about 40 percent of our total agricultural exports to the Common Market. The proposed Common Market policy would kill off a large part of these U.S. exports.

We have two remedies. We should use both of them.

On a unilateral basis, we can invoke section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Under section 252:

Whenever unjustifiable foreign import restrictions * * * oppress the commerce of the United States * * * the President shall take all appropriate and feasible steps within his power to eliminate such restrictions.

Included within the "steps" which the President may take are to "suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of benefits of trade agreement concessions to products" of the country imposing the unjustifiable restriction.

On a multilateral basis, we should take advantage of the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which protect countries against the nullification or impairment of benefits accruing to them under that agreement.

When countries join in forming a customs union, they must adopt common tariff rates for products on which each country may initially have applied different rates. The new common tariff for a given product is likely to be some average of the rates previously applied by the various member countries, which implies that some will lower and others will raise their tariffs to this level. Under article XXIV of GATT, the customs union may not adopt "duties and other regulations of commerce on the whole higher or more restrictive than the general incidence of the duties and general regulations of commerce applicable in the constituent territories prior to the formation of such union." If some customs union members raise duties on products on which they made concessions in earlier trade negotiations to a greater extent than other members lower their duties on such products, they may be called upon to compensate injured countries by making equivalent tariff reductions on other products.

It is hardly likely that the Common Market can offer the United States adequate compensation for agricultural restrictions through reductions of the Common Market tariffs on industrial goods. It is impossible for the Common Market to make adequate compensation to countries like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Denmark, since their exports of industrial goods to the Common Market are insignificant compared to their exports of agricultural products.

Accordingly, if the Common Market adopts its announced agricultural policy, it would violate article XXIV of GATT, and the Common Market would be "nullifying and impairing" concessions previously made by its member countries, within the meaning of article XXIII of GATT. Under article XXIII, a country which is injured by the Common Market's agricultural policy is authorized to withdraw previous concessions to the Common Market's member countries,

and may also be released from any obligation to the Common Market member countries.

SOME PRECEDENTS FOR RETALIATION

Such retaliatory action under GATT was in fact employed in a 1953 GATT decision on 1951 U.S. import restrictions on dairy products. Dr. Howard Pickett, of the Library of Congress, has prepared the following report for me on this decision:

At the sixth session of the contracting parties to the GATT the representatives of Denmark and the Netherlands, supported by the delegates of Australia, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, and Norway, complained that the restrictions on imports of dairy products introduced by the United States on August 9, 1951, under section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, had nullified, or impaired, within the meaning of article XXIII of the GATT, concessions granted by the United States. They also maintained that the restrictions constituted an infringement of article XI, which provides for the elimination of quantitative import restrictions. In view of the efforts of the executive branch of the U.S. Government to have section 104 repealed by Congress, however, the contracting parties agreed to leave the matter on the agenda.

At the seventh session of the GATT (after Congress had decided not to discontinue the so-called cheese amendment) Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, and New Zealand stated that their export trade in dairy products continued to be adversely affected by U.S. import quotas and stated that maintenance of the restrictions by the United States under section 104 of the Defense Production Act constituted an infringement of the GATT.

The Netherlands Government asked that the contracting parties permit it to restrict imports of wheat flour from the United States during 1953 in order to compensate for the damage suffered by Netherlands exports as a result of the restrictions imposed by the United States under section 104.

Contracting parties authorized the Netherlands to reduce its imports of wheat flour from the United States in 1953 from 72,000 to 60,000 metric tons. The Netherlands representative gave assurance that this retaliatory measure would be applied only so long as U.S. restrictions continued in force. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 expired on June 30, 1953.

More recently, we ourselves had occasion to apply to GATT under article XXIII. In November 1962, we informed GATT that France, by maintaining quota restrictions on the import of fresh and processed fruit and vegetables, was impairing concessions that this country had given. The members of GATT found that France was in violation of article XXIII and that it was impairing U.S. concessions granted during the 1960-61 Dillon round. We were, therefore, given permission to work out a withdrawal of concessions to France.

There is nothing illiberal about the U.S. retaliating against the Common Market, either under section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act or under article XXIII of GATT, if the Common Market persists in its agricultural protectionism. We would be guilty of far greater disservice to the cause of liberal trade if by our inaction we condoned trade discrimination by six of the most prosperous countries in the world.

INDUSTRIAL PROTECTIONISM

Second. Possible action against protectionism on industrial products.

If the Common Market is unyielding in its agricultural protectionism, or fails to make adequate compensation for its agricultural protectionism, or fails seriously to bargain down industrial tariffs, we should not sulk and retire from the negotiating table.

Instead, we should vigorously bargain with the United Kingdom, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Austria, Switzerland, and Portugal—the European Free Trade Association—with Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Japan, and the rest of the members of GATT. It is particularly important that we bargain with the EFTA countries, since by the end of 1966 these countries will have eliminated all tariffs between them on industrial products. This discrimination could seriously harm our U.S. exports for such products as paper products, machinery, vehicles, instruments, and consumer durables. The only way to eliminate the discrimination is to bargain down tariffs of the individual EFTA countries.

Certainly we should not be deterred from vigorous bargaining with all GATT members except an intransigent Common Market by the notion that the benefits of such negotiations would have to be passed on to the Common Market through the most-favored-nation clause contained in article I of GATT. This is absurd. Trade negotiations are not required to give the dog in the manger the biggest bone. Such a conclusion is required neither by the American history of the most-favored-nation clause, nor by the spirit of GATT itself.

WE CAN DISREGARD MOST FAVORED NATION IF NECESSARY

The unconditional most-favored-nation principle was first announced for the United States by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes back in 1923. Its purpose was and is an entirely valid one: To protect us and the rest of the free world against special deals whereby the party which has just given a trade concession wipes it out by giving somebody else a still more favorable concession.

In the past we have not hesitated to disregard the most-favored-nation principle where it collided with our national interests. In 1939, for example, the United States found that Nazi Germany was discriminating against U.S. commerce by the use of various export subsidy devices. We, therefore, increased tariffs on imports from Germany without also increasing them on the same commodities from other countries. Similarly, we have long refused most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-bloc countries.

If the Common Market, accordingly, does not comply with the reciprocal spirit of the upcoming GATT negotiations to the same extent as do other countries, either of the following alternatives could be used to prevent automatic extension of new benefits to the Common Market:

GETTING RID OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION

First. Amend article I of GATT, which now provides for general unconditional most-favored-nation treatment for all

contracting parties, so that such treatment shall not be accorded to any country or group of countries which are important suppliers of a product and which refuse to lower tariffs to the same extent as other important suppliers of the product. Under the provisions of GATT, such an amendment would require unanimous approval of the membership. If any country chooses to exercise its veto power over amending article I, other alternatives are available.

For example, the United States could request the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to invite all interested countries to participate in drafting a new trade instrument, which would be very much like GATT except that it would qualify the most-favored-nation clause. This instrument could then be the basis for new trade negotiations.

Such a new method to cope with emerging trade problems has its most famous precedent in United Nations history. When the power of the Soviet veto threatened paralysis in the Security Council, the United States initiated the uniting-for-peace action in the veto-proof Assembly. Similarly, if the threat of veto in GATT of an appropriate amendment of article I prevents the United States and other countries from entering into trade negotiations, we should unite with other countries in the veto threatened paralysis in the Security Cooperation and Development to make negotiations possible.

FORMING A FREE TRADE AREA

Second. Under the provisions of article XXIV, join with all GATT members, other than the countries of the Common Market, to form a free trade area under which participating countries would agree to percentage cuts in their entire tariff structure and would work out plans for additional percentage reductions in the future.

The benefits of the tariff cuts would not have to be extended to the Six—or to any other country which refused to go along. The door would be open to such countries to enter whenever they desired. While it is true that under article XXIV, a free trade area must eliminate tariffs on substantially all of the trade of its constituent territories, it is not required to do this at once. For example, GATT has not disapproved of the European Free Trade Association because it has not begun to reduce agricultural tariffs within the area, nor agreed on a specific plan for such reductions. The wider free trade area, including most of the major trading countries of the free world, should probably have actual free trade on all commodities only as an ultimate objective. If the present provisions of article XXIV prove too restrictive and do not permit this kind of free trade area, they could be amended under the procedure provided in paragraph 10 of article XXIV.

A strategy such as that here proposed may well produce a reasonable attitude on the part of the Common Market. Our present strategy merely rewards the Common Market for being intransigent.

Right now, before we get off to a false start, is a good time to change strategies. We should promptly announce our intention to bargain immediately for lower tariffs on a basis as wide as the whole free world—with the Common Market if we can, without it if we must.

THE LATE HONORABLE JESSICA McCULLOUGH WEIS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUMAN. Mr. Speaker, long before I had the honor of being able to say I was a friend of hers, I admired Judy Weis. She has always been, to me, one of the shining lights of the Republican Party, and her passing is a great personal loss.

Jessica McCullough Weis served her country well, first in her community, then as national Republican committee-woman, a member of the National Civil Defense Advisory Commission, and lastly as Representative in Congress from the State of New York. She was both a paragon and an incentive for all women. The memory of her accomplishments and the knowledge that she was so loved by so many people will bring comfort, now, to her children. To them I extend my deepest sympathy.

HOW SINCERE IS THE NEW FRONTIER?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most pressing problems is unemployment. Over 4 million persons are listed as unemployed; the unemployment rate in March was higher than it was a year ago. The administration wants to spend more money, establish new corps, build more public works, make more loans, establish more Federal agencies, add to Federal payroll—all in the hope of cutting the unemployment rate. Everyone shares in that hope. But much of the New Frontier's program will not create lasting jobs because it ignores the basic process by which jobs are made, and when the New Frontier pushes some programs, you wonder about the sincerity of its efforts to cut unemployment.

As an example of what I mean, I have been leading the opposition to the construction of a Federal power project called Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River. The New Frontier has been press-

ing very hard for its approval through the voice of the Secretary of Interior who made a rather unprecedented appearance before the committee in support of the project.

Completely aside from the issue of public versus private power, I want to deal with the economics of this project as it applies to total capital investment, taxes, community economic enhancement, and jobs.

If Trotters Shoals is constructed by the Federal Government, it would cost an estimated \$78,700,000. It would flood in excess of 22,000 acres and remove them from the tax duplicate and inundate an estimated eight major industrial sites. The hydroelectric plant would produce over 471 million kilowatt-hours of power per year, and have an estimated maintenance and operation cost of \$483,000 annually.

The Corps of Engineers did not state how many persons would be employed in constructing the project or in permanent employment. The corps did estimate that some \$394,000 annually in benefits would be derived from recreation, fish and wildlife.

If Trotters Shoals is not built, Mead Paper Corp. plans to build a \$40-million plant at this site. In 1956, Mead purchased 1,000 acres in this area and since then has spent \$1 million for timberlands and has entered into leaseholds amounting to an additional \$2 million.

If permitted to build, the construction of the mill, paper machine, and power-plant to produce 800 tons of product daily will require an initial investment of \$40 million; 1,400 men would be employed for 2 years in construction, earning \$10 million. New capital investment, creating new construction jobs, would be required every year thereafter at an estimated figure of \$1 million plus annually. When finished, the plant would employ 600 to 650 people, at an annual payroll of close to \$5 million. In addition, the mill would consume 400,000 to 450,000 cords of pulpwood annually, valued at \$8 to \$9 million, putting to work some 2,500 men annually on farms and woodlots nearby. Freight movements from the plant, averaging 18,000 carloads a year, would create other jobs.

If Trotters Shoals is not built, Duke Power Co. would build a steamplant at this site at an estimated cost of \$210 million; this is private capital, not tax dollars, and about three times the Federal Government's investment.

During the height of construction, over 1,000 men would be employed. It takes approximately 3 years to construct one unit of the plant and several units are planned. New capital investment creating additional construction jobs would be required every year thereafter at an estimated figure of \$2 million annually. When finished, the plant would employ 135 in permanent jobs. Annual payroll costs would amount to \$825,000. In addition, Duke Power would spend \$24 million per year for coal. This would be purchased from the coal fields of Virginia, West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky. It would require the use of some 38,000 railroad cars per year. The Duke plant would produce 11.4 billion kilo-

watt-hours of energy per year as opposed to the Federal project of 471.4 million. The lake required by Duke would submerge some 1,500 acres of land all owned by the company and would not interfere with the Mead plant. This is 7 percent of the land required by Trotters Shoals, and the balance of the land remains on the tax books by Duke's development. The smaller lake required by Duke would be available for recreation, but, of course, not to the extent of the larger one. However, there are two large Federal reservoirs in the immediate area, costing approximately \$100 million each with a storage capacity of 2.8 million acre-feet each.

The Mead plant would pay into the coffers of local, State, and Federal agencies some \$3.8 million annually in taxes over and above what it now pays. Duke Power would pay an additional \$13.3 million in taxes, making a total of over \$17 million annually paid in as taxes. The benefit-cost ratio of the Federal project was figured on a 50-year basis. If Trotters Shoals is not built, instead of spending some \$78 million of tax money, the governments would receive over the 50 years some \$850 million in taxes, besides about three times as much electric energy would be provided annually.

But this is only the beginning. Experience has taught us that as these plants are constructed, allied services and industries move into the area providing further investment and more permanent jobs. The additional payrolls are inducements to new industry. Land and property values around these developments increase, adding more revenues. To feed, house, clothe, educate, transport, provide medical care, hospitalization, and hundreds of other services humans need, would employ additional hundreds of people.

But, if Trotters Shoals is built, neither the Mead plant nor Duke powerplant will be constructed with the resulting loss of thousands of jobs, industrial sites, and taxes. Yet, Secretary Udall continues to push the construction by the Federal Government of Trotters Shoals. Trotters Shoals is not the kind of sound economic growth which produces lasting jobs, but to the contrary.

When these companies appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, they were not asking for Federal handouts. They were not asking for a public works project, or more Federal bureaus or another corps of some type, they merely wanted the opportunity to invest private capital for the expansion of their industries, thereby providing many thousands of jobs at no expense to the taxpayer.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from Sir Cyril Osborne, J.P., M.P., the other day. The honorable Member enclosed a copy of a speech from Hansard's, which he made recently in the House of Commons.

I was deeply gratified that Sir Cyril thought highly enough of the memorandum presented by the U.S. delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference at Lausanne to place a portion of it in the permanent record of the House of Commons, the mother of parliaments.

APRIL 30, 1963.

Congresswoman Mrs. K. ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I enclose here-with copy of a speech I made in the House of Commons last Friday, in which I referred to our discussions at Lausanne during the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference. You will see that I took the liberty of quoting from the memorandum which your delegation produced, and also quoted from your President.

I hope you had a pleasant trip home, and I send my warmest regards to all the members of your delegation.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL OSBORNE.

It has been said that we should look at the Commonwealth problem as a whole. It is true that, from the point of view of both density of population and wealth, the older dominions are in a better position to give great help, but we cannot tell them what they should do. Australia has 10 million people, a density of only 3 per square mile, and a per head income of £434 a year. New Zealand has a population of 2 million, with a density of 23 and an annual income of £472 per annum. Canada has a population of 18 million, a density of 5 to the square mile, and the highest per capita income in the Commonwealth, £544—but we cannot tell them that they themselves must go to help others.

We can set an example if we are prepared to do so, but it would mean very savagely cutting our social services, our welfare state. I ask honorable Members on both sides to be honest with themselves and with the people to whom they make these high promises. Are they prepared to pay the price of their promises? It is when the United Kingdom is faced with these enormous problems that I wonder whether we would not be wiser to talk more cautiously about the Commonwealth, and what we can and will do for it.

Last week, I attended the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference in Lausanne, where this matter was discussed as part of the world problem—because our relationship with the poorer parts of the Commonwealth is but one sector of the greater problem facing the Western wealth world and the poorer Eastern and African world. At the end of the Conference we said that the only way to increase the standard of living of the under-developed peoples is to increase the prices of the raw materials they produce, and then stabilize world prices. We cannot do that ourselves; it will require international action. Next year, the United Nations is to hold an economic conference, and I want our Government to do all it can to support it.

I want to draw the attention of honorable Members to statements contained in three memorandums presented to the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference at Lausanne. The U.S. memorandum stated:

"The average annual per capita gross national product of the less developed countries amounts to only \$130, compared with an average of \$1,470 for the developed countries, and with \$2,700 for the United States."

As the average in the poorer countries is only \$130, there are places with far less than that. The Americans also stated:

"In the less developed countries the illiteracy rate is 67 percent."

They added this personal note. President Kennedy said this to his people, and it could well be said to us:

"If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

It is our own interests that we should do something for the poorer sections of the Commonwealth, but we should face the price.

WELCOME; BUT OVERDUE CHANGE IN PROCUREMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago I recommended what I considered an important change in the armed services procurement regulations, the rules under which all of our military equipment is bought. Today I can report that the Secretary of Defense has seen fit to make the very change I suggested, and for that he should be congratulated.

At the same time I think it only fitting that he should be warned that what he decides as policy and what is carried out at lower levels of command often differ greatly. That was true last year when he established his new freedom of information policy in the Department of Defense, making it possible for industry to get the technical materials it needs to bid on Government purchases. That policy has been ignored, subverted and prostituted since the day the papers were signed. It was also true last year when he changed another ASPR regulation. That change made it mandatory that American industry be given bidding information whenever it requested it. That change was being shoved under the rug by procurement agencies before the ink was dry on the signature.

This latest change can mean little to those unacquainted with the intricacies of military procurement. For those who do business with Uncle Sam, however, it is a policy change that will do much to induce more light and air into defense purchasing. It could have major consequences—if what the Secretary has decided to do is implemented at lower levels of command.

On October 1, 1962, my suggestion was made. On March 1, 1963, it was carried out, but I did not know about it until April 18, 1963. That matters little. What does matter is that this policy—together with the other changes—should be carried out in the spirit in which the changes were made. In short, Secretary McNamara's desire for more economical procurement should be honored by the people who work for him. That has not been the case in the Defense Department for many years—under various Secretaries.

To justify my concern over the way this latest change will be carried out, I must state that I already have evidence the new policy is being either ignored or subverted in various agencies. Shortly, I will forward to the Secretary of Defense several examples of such subversion. I trust he will find time to have them investigated and to take corrective measures if they are indicated.

Mr. Speaker, the change I speak of was referred to by me in a letter dated October 1, 1962, to Brig. Gen. C. R. Roderick, Director of Legislative Liaison for the Secretary of Defense. It deals with what is called a two-step procurement action. The first step of such a purchase is to issue a request for technical proposals that are unpriced. These proposals are then evaluated and in a second step those firms considered competent are asked to bid competitively on the equipment needed. Under the old armed services procurement regulations rules the second step was hidden from the public. No advertisement was made in the Commerce Business Daily, and bid sets were issued only to those firms surviving step one of the procurement.

It was my feeling that the second step should be advertised in the Commerce Business Daily and that any firm desiring bid sets should be given them. This would allow subcontractors to participate directly with those firms included in the second step of the procurement and would also put the full force and light of public disclosure on information and competition on the procurement.

That is the gist of my comments to General Roderick. On October 3, 1963, the general assured me every consideration would be given my suggestions when ASPR changes were considered. Imagine my pleasure when I saw in the Commerce Business Daily of April 12, 1963, that procurement officers at L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., were doing exactly what I recommended in a purchase of an equipment known as AN/TMQ-14—Cloud Height Set. The Hanscom officers advertised the second step of this procurement as I had recommended to General Roderick.

Since I feel that good procurement should be lauded just as poor procurement is chastised, I wrote the Secretary of Defense on April 15, 1963, and stated in part:

This is excellent procurement policy and follows exactly along the lines I suggested in my letter of October 1, 1962, to Brig. Gen. C. R. Roderick.

Is it possible now to get the regulation amended so that all agencies must follow Hanscom's lead? I feel that good procurement practice such as this should certainly be brought to the attention of Congress.

On April 18, 1963, I received an answer from Charles N. Gregg, Jr., Special Assistant to the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense in charge of legislative affairs. It said in part:

You will be interested to know that ASPR 1-1003.3(a) (2), as it appears in the edition of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations issued March 1, 1963, requires that the names and addresses of firms which have submitted technical proposals in the first step of two-step formal advertising be synopsized in the Commerce Business Daily.

Thus, I learned that my suggestion of 6 months ago had found its way into ASPR, even as my earlier suggestion had been included in the regulations. This one required the Navy to get in step with the other services and issue bid sets on procurements to firms requesting them even if a negotiated or sole-source purchase was contemplated. I called that change "a step in the best interests of good government and competitive bidding." I refer to ASPR 1-1002(b).

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that some of my procurement suggestions are found to be desirable by the Department of Defense. I only wish more changes could be effected to get more competition into the manufacture of defense equipment. Until it is, "The Billion-Dollar-A-Week Club" in the Pentagon will go on wasting tax dollars indiscriminately through bureaucratic bungling, incompetency and inefficiency if not through outright duplicity.

LOREN GAJEWSKI

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD today for the sole purpose of bringing to the attention of the Congress and the Nation the enclosed article from the May 1963 issue of Farm and Ranch about Loren Gajewski, a North Dakota farmer now apparently under sentence because the court feels itself legally barred from ruling on the legality of ASCS findings.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is responsible for the laws under which action of this type takes place. Will we stand idly by and surrender our people's freedom to bureaus and agencies?

BEFORE I GO TO JAIL

(By H. F. McQueen)

"Why not execute 10 percent of American farmers each year—and continue this slaughter until crop production is reduced to the desired level? This process would be as constitutional as the present allotment programs—and besides it would save taxpayers \$6 billion a year."

These are strong words by Loren Gajewski, an Alexander, N. Dak., wheat farmer. He said them while on trial before a Federal court in Minot, N. Dak. Gajewski, another farmer fighting for freedom to farm at the risk of losing everything, has already received a 2-year prison sentence for what Federal attorneys and USDA call, "attempting to impede and defeat the Agricultural Adjustment Act." Out now on \$5,000 bond, Gajewski, and farmers like him across the Nation, are making their voices heard in opposition to any more control programs—particularly wheat, since a do-or-die referendum is pending.

His fight is unusual for several reasons. Most important: The prison sentence looming over his wary head is the first we know of handed down for violations of govern-

mental farm programs. Legislation hasn't yet been passed by Congress making it a criminal offense to disregard acreage allotments. (The 1964 wheat program, if the referendum passes, provides for penalties of up to \$10,000 and up to 10 years in prison for wheat allotment violations.)

Furthermore, Gajewski maintains the original family land patents grant the owner the "right to do with, as he sees fit" his acreage—and that the owner is responsible to no one for the use he makes of his land.

Gajewski angrily denies USDA charges that he has overseeded his wheatlands since 1954—a charge which resulted in the prison sentence. "Impossible," he declares, "The farm in question has been growing wheat since the early 1900's. And the people who farmed the land before we bought it in 1948 gave us signed affidavits to this effect."

"Each year I planted about the same acreage to wheat as had the previous operators—yet in 1957 the McKenzie County ASCS office decided this farm had no wheat history. They said it was virgin sod up to 1954—that not one grain of wheat had ever been produced on this farm."

"But remember, all this took place in 1957 after I had grown four consecutive crops. And during the period 1954-57, never had ASCS sent out any notice saying my acreage seeded was in excess. In fact, ASCS never said a word about my plantings and never even came out to measure the acreage. And they waited another 2 years before making an issue of their charges."

It wasn't 'till January 1959 that Loren Gajewski and his brother Mervin received allotment notices through the mail for wheat grown in 1954 through 1957—and at the same time, were assessed penalties of over \$5,000 for violations of allotments during the past 6 years.

The court refused to admit mitigating testimony involving the local ASCS office activities under command of Office Manager Marvin Thill.

At the trial over this unheard-of assessment by an ASCS committee, U.S. Attorney John Garass said, for the record, "The Gajewski land has never been measured, nor have any excess allotment notices been sent out prior to 1959." But, added Garass, "The court has no jurisdiction over ASCS determinations and therefore the question of legality of their determinations is immaterial."

Garass, representing the district of North Dakota, told Gajewski after the trial, "This office has no control provided by law over the various ASCS committees of the Department of Agriculture. If you are dissatisfied with their rulings, I suggest you take whatever steps are provided by law for appeal or rehearings."

If the Justice Department has no control over what ASCS committees and office managers decide to do—right or wrong—who does? Gajewski counters. (And it is a good question. Do you know what court would hear your plea since Federal courts refuse to admit evidence that might show ASCS in error?)

"Of course," says Gajewski, "I had a trial by jury. But the constitutional right of every American of a trial by jury was denied by the simple expedient of the court's refusing to charge the jury with any question which might enable them to recognize the historic wheat base of a farm."

A longtime friend and Government-in-agriculture fighter, Lawrence Naaden, claims: "ASCS thus broke its own regulations in establishing farm allotments, quotas, and farm marketing excesses years after they should have been issued. Those charges against ASCS were spelled out in Gajewski's appeal, but were denied by the court on the same grounds—that it could not rule on whether ASCS had made these determinations legally or illegally."

"In other words, if ASCS were as corrupt as sin—which it is—none of their proven illegal acts could be told to the jury. Of what value is a court that cannot, or will not, hear both sides of a case—especially when fraud on the part of the plaintiff (ASCS in this case) is admitted and stipulated as a matter of court record? If Gajewski's shoddy treatment at the hands of Federal courts is any indication of what is in store for other American farmers—and nonfarmers—we surely have lost all our freedoms," says Naaden.

"In observing this case," says Dr. Robert Morris, president of Defenders of American Liberties, "it is most important that Americans everywhere realize and recognize the fact that the courts say they cannot rule on decisions made by ASCS, regardless of how fraudulent such determinations may be."

"In essence this whole thing is rotten," says another of Gajewski's farmer-friend, Leo Landsberger, of Hazelton, N. Dak. "I fully believe that if ASCS ruled the moon is made of green cheese the court would have to rule that, as a matter of law, the ASCS committee was right—even though the evidence to support their findings was arrived at from the back steps of the ASCS office."

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER OF NEW YORK SEES ADEQUATE MINORITY STAFFS AS NECESSARY TO THE RESPONSIBLE AND EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING OF REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGER. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York has watched for some time, with deep concern and interest, the activities of Republican Members of the House and Senate to increase the number of minority staff members on congressional committees.

Governor Rockefeller served as a member of the Governors' conference subcommittee on minority staffing which last summer issued one of the first hard-hitting and constructive statements about the need for adequate minority staffing on congressional committees, especially as it relates to Federal-State relationships.

It is, therefore, with considerable satisfaction that the subcommittee on minority staffing of the Republican conference calls attention to the following letter on this issue which New York's distinguished Governor wrote:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, April 22, 1963.
The Honorable FRED SCHWENGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: For some time I have followed with great interest the efforts which you and other Republicans in Congress have been making to correct the serious imbalance which exists with respect to minority staffing on congressional committees. I was particularly pleased to note in January the appointment by GERRY FORD, the chairman of

the Republican conference, of a special conference subcommittee on minority staffing with you as chairman.

This is an issue which transcends partisan politics and goes to the very roots of our political system. An informed and articulate opposition party is essential to the proper functioning of our democratic form of government, and only with adequate staffing can the opposition perform its role in a responsible and effective way.

Not only must the Republican Party be prepared to offer sound criticism and constructive alternatives to the programs and policies of the administration and the Democratic Congress, it must also be in a position to provide independent analysis of the wide range of complex problems which exist today, with a view to developing and initiating uniquely Republican solutions.

Such an effort requires continuing long-range research of a high order. The efforts which you in the Congress are making to rectify the present unfortunate situation regarding minority staffing and to promote this type of research effort are highly commendable. All of you have my full support and best wishes for success in this endeavor.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

NELSON.

RETRAINING—A GOOD INVESTMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although the Federal Government in recent years has embarked upon a program for retraining unemployed workers, it is well to recall that some of our States have pioneered in this important work. A recent series of articles in the New England Business Review, which is published monthly by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, describes the experience of some of the New England States with training and retraining programs. Besides discussing the New England experience, the series covers the subject of interest in training among the unemployed and concludes with a discussion of "Retraining—A Good Investment."

In many respects, this final article in the series is especially interesting. It points out that careful studies by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security showed that savings in unemployment compensation after retraining were large enough to pay off the entire investment in retraining in about 5 years.

These articles do not try to sugar-coat retraining and make it appear simple and without problems. Problems exist and they are discussed candidly. But the promise and the opportunities of retraining are also made evident, and the conclusion is that retraining can provide an inexpensive method for helping a significant number of the unemployed to help themselves. Under permission

granted, I include the series of articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From New England Business Review, August 1962]

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED—PART I: THE NEW ENGLAND EXPERIENCE

Retraining the unemployed is to be vastly increased by the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. However, the practice of retraining the unemployed is relatively new and very little actual experience has been obtained.

Two New England States have had pioneering programs in retraining the unemployed, one of which anticipated by several years the first pilot Federal program under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. New England has also participated fully in the Area Redevelopment Act program. It is therefore possible to gain some valuable information by looking at the first experiences of retraining in New England.

Seventy-seven percent of the 638 New England trainees of the Area Redevelopment Act have been placed in jobs related to their training with another 5 percent being placed in other jobs after training. Some of the placements have been outside the redevelopment area. This program has had from the start a handicap in that a redevelopment area by definition does not have a normal demand for labor. It should be noted that 100 percent placement is not necessary for retraining to be considered a success.

The significance of the Connecticut and Massachusetts State programs initiated before Area Redevelopment Act is that they are not confined to but include "depressed areas," and therefore provide a better test of the effectiveness of retraining than the Area Redevelopment Act program.

CONNECTICUT RETRAINING

Early in 1961, the State of Connecticut instituted the community action program training course for the unemployed. The combined efforts of the vocational, apprentice training, and research staff of the State set up a program which was first instituted in Bridgeport on May 15, 1961. Seventeen machine tool operator trainees started a course in the local high school. Since then 660 unemployed workers have been trained in skills including welding, machine tool operation, and power sewing machine operation. In each case the job openings were identified and assurances were obtained from employers who said that they could absorb any trainee graduated from the course. Comprehensive testing and interviewing was done for the selection of the trainees. A curriculum was developed and classes scheduled to be taught at the local technical high schools with no charge for tuition. The unemployed were able to continue receiving unemployment compensation during training. Almost all the trainees participating in the community action program have been placed in jobs which will give them on-the-job experience in their new skills.

The Connecticut program was similar to the area redevelopment program in that extensive screening of applicants was done, and only specific programs were offered to the unemployed.

MASSACHUSETTS RETRAINING

The Massachusetts program is an older and far different type of retraining program. A series of amendments to the unemployment compensation benefit law were made starting in 1956 so that an unemployed person taking a vocational training course could

¹ The area redevelopment program in New England was described in the April 1962 issue of the New England Business Review. Since that date four additional courses have been approved for 355 unemployed individuals in New England redevelopment areas.

be considered as available for work and therefore eligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits while training. In fact, an 18-week extension of the benefits was provided if this extension were necessary to complete the approved course providing potential benefits of 48 weeks.

Each course was selected by the trainee and approved by the appropriate State agency, division of vocational education or division of employment security, if it would serve as a means of realizing employment. The student paid tuition, if any.

Although no major advertising of this program has been done, approximately 1,300 individuals have taken advantage of the program since the first active year (1958) with approximately 300 having had a year's work experience since their retraining. This latter group does represent one of the largest groups of unemployed who (1) have had retraining, (2) have re-entered the labor market, and (3) have a year's work experience since retraining.

A joint research project was undertaken by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security in order to evaluate the success of the retrainees under this program. A questionnaire was sent to the 900 who had participated in approved programs by the end of 1961, for most of 1962 applicants were still in school. More than three-fourths of all those surveyed responded. In addition, a survey of other claimants who were similar in age, sex, previous occupation, geographic region, and date of compensation was made to establish a control group, i.e., a group of people with similar backgrounds, who had not had retraining. The purpose of this control group was to establish whether the change in income and steadiness of employment was due to retraining or to some other factors such as a better business climate which would affect all such individuals.

IMPROVED ANNUAL INCOME

Initial placement is just one test of the effectiveness of retraining. A more difficult and perhaps more important question is: Does retraining improve income and job stability?

The survey of the retrainees of the Massachusetts program has yielded some impressive results as to the effectiveness of retraining. Those people in this program who (1) were laid off, (2) took some form of vocational retraining, and (3) have been out working for more than 1 year, on the average, increased their yearly income by almost \$1,000, or 35 percent.² The increase in yearly income for people who were similar to the retrainees but who did not have the advantage of retraining was \$250, or 10 percent in the same time period. Retraining did pay off for the typical trainee in the Massachusetts program, although more of the improvement in their annual income came from increased steadiness of employment, rather than an increase in weekly wage. The increase in weeks worked per year was 7 weeks, providing almost steady employment (48.7 weeks per year) while the \$8.50 increase in weekly wage was not much greater than the control group.

The courses taken by the retrainees were determined by individual choice, limited

² It was possible to quit a job to go to vocational school, serve the required 10-week disqualification period for quitting, and then apply for benefits. About 20 percent of the applicants were of this type. The results of the voluntary quit group were separated from the involuntary separation group for the above statistics. In general, the voluntary quit group did significantly better than the control group, but not quite as well as the involuntary separation group.

only by the available institutions with courses that would be approved by the respective State agencies. As it developed, the courses taken were mainly in preparation for entrance in the service or clerical field. In fact, half of the whole group was studying to be barbers and beauticians. Six percent of the group were studying to become IBM office machine operators. A substantial number of women took a course to qualify as a registered practical nurse. Other women were taking courses in stenography and typing. Technicians, mainly electrical, accounted for 9 percent.

One of the advantages of this type of training program was that there were more than 72 types of training courses offered by both public and private institutions taken by these trainees ranging from training to be hospital attendants to a 6-week course in teacher training.

Trainee characteristics

| Age group | Massachusetts trainees (percent) | Massachusetts unemployed (percent) | U.S. unemployed (percent) | Years of school completed | Massachusetts trainees (percent) | Massachusetts unemployed (percent) |
|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Under 25 | 51.8 | 14.9 | 33.2 | 8 and under | 12.4 | 31.2 |
| 25 to 34 | 25.6 | 17.6 | 19.6 | 9 and 10 | 18.7 | 21.1 |
| 35 to 44 | 12.5 | 21.6 | 17.1 | 11 and 12 | 58.0 | 39.7 |
| 45 to 54 | 8.1 | 21.3 | 15.7 | 1 or 2 (college) | 7.1 | 4.9 |
| 55 to 64 | 1.5 | 13.7 | 10.6 | More than 2 (college) | 3.8 | 3.1 |
| 65 and over | .5 | 11.7 | 3.8 | Average education | 10.9 | 10.0 |
| Average age | 28.4 | 43 | 35 | | | |

Source: U.S. Department of Labor and Massachusetts Division of Employment Security.

Perhaps the greatest testimony of the effectiveness of the program itself is from the many comments which were written on the questionnaire by the retrainees.

There is a statement of this success from a 23-year-old male from Somerville who had taken a course in the operation and wiring of I.B.M. machines. His testimony follows:

"The training I was able to receive made it possible for me to obtain a good position with great opportunity for advancement. I certainly feel that many good workers can be retrained and helped to find steady employment."

This particular individual had worked for 36 weeks in the previous year at \$50 a week. He is now working with I.B.M. equipment at \$90 a week and working steadily. Another man who was successful in electronics had this reply to the question: Would you have taken this course without unemployment compensation benefits?

"I would have continued to try and complete my desired education, but I must not minimize that help that I received through the unemployment office. It gave me a feeling that, because I was trying to improve myself, they were willing to help me financially."

Receiving unemployment compensation while they were learning did provide strong motivation for self-improvement for other individuals as well. From a woman taking a secretarial course came this quotation:

"It is very satisfying to know that you can receive an income while learning. More of an incentive to improve your position."

Many of these individuals, particularly those who had quit their jobs, were highly motivated and would have taken training without the aid. However, almost 60 percent of those who were laid off would not have taken the course had it not been for the program. With the aid of the program, 90 percent of the entire group finished their course work successfully.

Many of these workers were motivated by the drive to obtain steady employment as evidenced by this quotation from a 41-year-old housewife now making \$40 a week as a beautician:

"Two years ago I came over here from England. It was quite easy to find a job,

Because there were so many different courses with relatively few in each course—except for the barbers and beauticians—it was possible to compare meaningfully the results of the various types of training for only a few categories. The group taking IBM machine courses did fare better than the barbers and beauticians (at least during their apprenticeships). The practical nurses increased their weekly wage by \$8, to \$57, and the IBM operators by \$10, to \$75. The barbers and beauticians actually suffered a loss in weekly wage of \$10, to \$65. But the latter group still managed to increase its annual income by a one-fourth increase in employment time.

If the experience of the barbers is excluded from the experience of the other retrainees, the results of the remaining trainees are even more impressive. There is a 16 percent increase in weekly wage and an increase in average annual income of 50 percent.

to take a 10-week course in typing. This lady was very happy with her new job and her \$58-a-week pay which she considered to be a big improvement.

Some of the individuals who took advantage of this program were referred to the employment office by the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission. One man who had suffered and was recovering from a nervous breakdown took a course in electronic mechanical drafting. This man obtained a job as a senior draftsman and has been working steadily ever since.

This program was instrumental in enabling a 38-year-old male from Worcester to finally realize an 11-year-old ambition to become a teacher. This individual was a machinist and during a period of layoff took the vocational teacher training course at one of the Massachusetts State colleges during which he was allowed unemployment benefits. After a year of training he was employed as a machinist again and took the second year of teacher training 2 nights a week. He is now qualified and has been hired to teach at a vocational school.

Even college graduates have benefited from this program when they were laid off:

"Although I had a B.A. degree in economics, I had to start in all over again to gain the necessary credits to enter the teaching field. Being able to attend the intensive teacher training program offered at one of the State teaching colleges was certainly a great boon to me. This is my first year teaching and I like it very much."

Many individuals who did not receive a job directly as a result of training did not feel any regret as to their taking such training:

"I did not receive a job utilizing the knowledge that I have received in school. However, the fact that I have furthered my education helped me to acquire my present job."

Some individuals took a course which would give them a higher skill in the same industry. One individual said in describing his experience:

"I have been working in shoe factories for 10 to 12 years, always having my pay vary from \$3,000 to \$4,500 a year with seasonal layoffs. I decided to learn a good trade at shoemaking that would keep me busy all year round. That I did at the * * * shoemaking school under wonderful guidance and I now have a future to look forward to."

The man is now making \$100 weekly plus overtime and working steadily.

If future retraining experience lives up to the potential shown in the New England experience, it might solve the employment problem for many individuals who have found or will find that there is little demand for their particular talents, unless further developed.

However, initial success in the first New England retraining programs does not necessarily mean that retraining will provide an answer for finding employment for a substantial number of the unemployed. As illustrated in the table, the person who elected to take advantage of the program is significantly younger and better educated than the unemployed taken as a whole. Thus it cannot be assumed that all unemployed would derive comparable benefits from retraining.

A more thorough discussion of the general application of retraining to the unemployed will be deferred to part II of this series.

[From New England Business Review, September 1962]

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED—PART II, INTEREST IN TRAINING

In part I of this article, apparent success was recorded for the initial retraining experience in New England. Nevertheless, there are formidable obstacles to retraining many of the unemployed. The advanced age and general lack of education of many such people are major barriers to both the inter-

* Quite a few barbers and beauticians (15 percent) did not remain in their apprenticeship because of low salary prospects for at least 18 months.

est in training and the ability to benefit by it. These and other problems (noted later) will limit the general applicability of retraining.

However, it is quite possible that the attitudes of the unemployed toward retraining might not be as serious a handicap as many have imagined.

As a part of the joint research project with the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, a questionnaire—designed to find out how the unemployed felt toward retraining—was sent to 1 percent (randomly selected) of 1961 unemployment compensation claimants. A 45-percent response was obtained.

Almost two-thirds of the 1,450 respondents felt that vocational training could aid them in improving their weekly wage and steadiness of employment, and only one-third of those surveyed said they would not consider taking such training if they were faced with unemployment. The principal reason given for not considering such training was advanced years. The combination of advanced age and lack of education discouraged many of the unemployed considering training even though they were favorably disposed to it. A Lynn woman with a seventh grade education wrote:

"As much as I'd like to change I feel that at 57 years I am no longer fit for any other kind of work. I've been a shoe worker for the past 28 years and it is a little too late to change."

Another major reason for not considering training was satisfaction with present employment (despite seasonal or sporadic lay-off).

WILLING TO TRAIN

Most of the unemployed who were willing to take training felt that they could take such training only if it were free and available near their homes. However, 1 in 4 of those interested expressed a willingness to live away from home while training (with free schooling and a subsistence allowance) while only 1 in 10 felt that he would be able

to take training if he had to pay a tuition cost of \$20 a week.¹

A typical comment on the possibility of paying tuition of \$20 a week while taking retraining was:

"If I was unemployed it would probably be impossible to pay as much as \$20 a week for schooling."

It should be noted that a typical unemployed person, even when retrained, cannot be expected to command a large weekly salary if only because he has less formal education. Massachusetts retrainees averaged \$74 a week after training. Area Redevelopment trained machinist apprentices started in Massachusetts at \$68 to \$75 a week. Many are being trained for skills in which the entry wage is considerably lower than the average production worker salary which is \$89 in Massachusetts and \$97 in the United States.

Many of the unemployed did not expect extremely high salaries after retraining. In response to the question asking how large a weekly salary would be expected in order to make training worth while (assuming steady employment), the response was divided approximately equally between less than \$80, requirements of \$80 to \$99 and requirements of over \$100 a week. Very few (5 percent) were willing to train for jobs paying less than \$60 a week. These attitudes toward salary opportunities are extremely important since many of the jobs for which retraining might be feasible are not likely to yield a particularly high weekly salary.

In Table I there is a listing of courses which the unemployed would consider taking. The most popular future vocations among the unemployed men were electronics technicians and machinist apprentices. Many of the women wanted to become computer equipment workers. These choices were listed on the questionnaire and each interested unemployed person was asked to check one or more of these job categories. The percentage represents the proportion of those interested who would consider training for this type of work.

TABLE 1.—Interest in training course

| Course | Percentage of males interested in retraining ¹ | Course | Percentage of females interested in retraining ¹ |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| Electronic technician..... | 40.9 | Computer equipment..... | 53.4 |
| Machinist's apprentice..... | 36.8 | Practical nursing..... | 23.7 |
| Office work..... | 12.9 | Secretarial skills..... | 22.5 |
| Barbering..... | 10.3 | Typists..... | 19.9 |
| Bookkeeping..... | 8.9 | Bookkeeping..... | 18.1 |
| Beautician..... | 3.8 | Beautician..... | 17.8 |

¹ Many unemployed considered taking more than 1 course, therefore total equals more than 100 percent.

When the 900 respondents who were interested in retraining were asked to name some other type of training which they would like to have, there was a great diversity of response. Many indicated that they would like to be trained in the industries with which they had experience. Others wanted to retrain primarily for income purposes and asked hopefully for guidance as to what particular field of training to enter. Over 100 different categories of training were mentioned, but only three—welding, carpentry and cabinet making, and mechanics—were mentioned 10 or more times. Vocational interest was diversified, and many of those surveyed were realistic in judging their own limitations.

EAGER FOR TRAINING

There are people eager for training, so eager in fact, that they wanted to make immediate application. This eagerness is illustrated by the young (21) sheet metal-worker:

"I am very interested in receiving training in the field of designing. I took a test

from your office and it shows I am very adept to this type of vocation."

Another enthusiastic individual said:

"I would really like to do as this questionnaire says. It's just what I was waiting for."

But the eager are not exclusively among the young. For example, this seventh grade educated male who is 61 years old from Fall River:

"Would like to take any type of training that would give me year-round work at a decent wage. Makes no difference where I have to go to get it."

The desire to obtain steady employment is an extremely strong motivating force as witnessed by this man from Springfield:

"I have been working at the building trade for 12 years and the last few years I

¹ A fee paid by many of the retrainees under the existing Massachusetts program even though free vocational education in certain courses is available at night from the Massachusetts Department of Vocational Education.

have had an average of 2 or 3 months unemployment every year around January to March. The reason I would be willing to accept a lower wage is if it were steady work. But if my own job were more steady, I would much prefer my own trade."

Desperation is part of the motivation of some of the long-term unemployed. For instance this 53-year-old man who lives in New Bedford:

"I would take any vocational training *** I need a job badly. I do not have any benefits to collect this year."

BACKGROUND EDUCATION

Finding employment for the unemployed with or without retraining is a multiple problem. For example, it is harder to find employment for older workers or for minority groups who are subject to discrimination. This problem is compounded by the fact that typically both groups have less formal education. Consequently, the frequent job requirement of a high school education excludes many in these groups.

Although an individual cannot be made younger, he can be given more education—if he is willing. Over half of the people surveyed who were willing to take training indicated that they would also be willing to take a course to improve their skills in reading or writing. A course in arithmetic seemed to be very popular with 70 percent. Here is a recognition on the part of the unemployed themselves of the lack of basic education which is considered essential for most types of vocational education in the United States today. They are correct: in three New England areas 48, 55, and 65 percent of those who were tested at State employment offices for an area redevelopment training course could not pass the course qualification examination. This testing took place after the elimination of more than twice as many candidates through preliminary screening.

The unresolved question is not whether vocational education will make an unemployed person more employable, but is: "How many of the unemployed can qualify for vocational education?" If attempts are to be made to retrain many of the unemployed it will be necessary to provide some concentrated basic education in order to prepare many of these individuals for formal vocational education.

It will also be necessary to accept the idea that training is necessary in basic habits and skills which are rudimentary to a large part of the adult population. Basic cleanliness standards may have to be taught to women so that they may become adequate hotel maids, or domestic servants. Competence in arithmetic is an essential prerequisite for many waiters' or waitresses' jobs. Although these jobs usually pay low wages, the steadiness of employment would provide a substantial improvement for many of the "hard to employ."

SUCCESSFUL STITCHERS

Questions are sometimes raised about the need for giving relatively elementary courses such as food handling or the running of a sewing machine because such skills are often acquired at home. However, a 3-week course designed to teach women how to be stitchers for the needle trade in Biddeford-Sanford, Maine, had remarkable success. Before this course there were both a shortage of stitchers and a large group of unemployed women, but the two had not been brought together. The course was so successful that it was possible to train and place more trainees than the 22 officially authorized. This was possible because many trainees did not need a full 3 weeks training before they became acceptable producers. When unemployed workers can be trained for unfilled jobs after a brief course, such training, however elementary, seems quite worthwhile.

NO PANACEA

Retraining cannot be thought of as a panacea for unemployment. The sheer magnitude of the unemployed (over 230,000 in New England and about 4.4 million in the United States) precludes this. There will always be particular job openings which will be unfilled despite substantial numbers of unemployed. As illustrated by table II skills in demand are heavily weighted toward the professional, managerial and skilled categories, while the unemployed are concentrated in unskilled and semiskilled categories.

TABLE II.—*Job skill requirements¹ and skills of U.S. unemployed, March 1962*

[In percent]

| | Skill requirements | Skills of unemployed |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Total..... | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Clerical and sales..... | 11.4 | 12.9 |
| Professional and managerial..... | 59.0 | 3.2 |
| Service..... | 2.9 | 8.0 |
| Skilled..... | 19.8 | 20.7 |
| Semiskilled..... | 6.7 | 24.8 |
| Unskilled and unreported..... | .2 | 30.4 |

¹ Requirements are for interoffice requests. All local job listings are not included.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, The Labor Market and Employment Security, April 1962.

Even when skills have been achieved these cannot always be readily transferred to skills in demand. Retraining the unemployed cannot be expected to fill the shortages of engineers, scientists, statisticians, and accountants. These and other shortage occupations will have to be relieved by changes in the educational system and adjustments in relative wage rates.

Retraining some unemployed will help fill the needs of other occupations. Certainly, some machinists will be developed from the various retraining programs. The widespread demand for other skilled craftsman such as automobile mechanics could be partially met through retraining. The shortage of clerical help can also be met in part by retraining unemployed females who previously had only factory experience.

GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY

More employment opportunities might be found by increasing the geographic mobility of displaced workers. Geographic mobility is considerable among employed males and even more pronounced among the unemployed.² In fact, 9 percent of the respondents indicated that they moved to find new employment. However, it is unrealistic to expect all the unemployed to be capable of moving themselves, especially those with families since they will often deplete all personal resources before considering a move. Another factor inhibiting geographic mobility among the unemployed is the general lack of demand even in the more prosperous labor markets for unskilled or semiskilled work, typically the only type of job the unemployed can fill. Retraining combined with relocation might be a useful combination of remedies.

ADAPTABILITY NEEDED

Subsistence payments while retraining under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 can be for 52 weeks. However, even with courses designed for the maximum time, it is never possible to prepare a person fully for a particular job; in a broad sense most training is on the job. Retraining for the unemployed is not designed to relieve employers of their function

(generated by necessity) of continued worker education, but will eliminate some handicaps of the unemployed which in the past have prevented them from obtaining steady employment.

The problem of making our labor force more adaptable to the demands of our complex and changing economy is a difficult one. To illustrate: New England employment in general increased 7 percent between 1950 and 1960, but the employment of laborers decreased 24 percent in the same time period. In contrast, the employment of professionals has increased 40 percent.

Continued efforts to improve formal education will have salutary long-term effects. Since working years, from entry into the work force until retirement, range to 50 years or more, most of the work force of the next few decades has already had its formal education. Skills of the existing work force therefore must be upgraded. The chief burden for this will be borne by employers: they will be forced to absorb the cost of training personnel simply because it will be necessary to get the job done. Retraining some unemployed for skills in current and future demand will help to fill new labor needs. Better educated graduates who enter the labor market each June will also help satisfy some of these future demands.

Many jobs that exist today and will exist tomorrow cannot be filled by retraining the unemployed directly. As more and more upgrading is achieved, some unemployed can be absorbed where vacancies are created at unskilled or semiskilled levels.

The practice of upgrading the employed through training is not new. It occurs through the use of both formal and vocational adult education courses, both in cooperation with employing firms and independent of such firms. Perhaps the expansion of adult education facilities would help more workers use leisure to increase their vocational skills. Such action would also enhance the productive potential of the country.

The Manpower Development and Training Act which was passed this year will provide for tuition-free training for the unemployed, the underemployed, and farmers with low family incomes. The training will include vocational courses, on-the-job training, or a combination of the two. To receive payment equal to unemployment compensation, the person must be head of a household and must have had 3 years of gainful employment. Unemployed youths not qualifying for regular benefits may receive a weekly payment of up to \$20.

Under this act \$435 million has been authorized for a 3-year program. About 1 million retrainees will be trained with the authorized funds. If 1 million unemployed can be authorized, given the major obstacles of advanced years and low educational levels, the country will have taken a significant step in increasing the adaptability of its labor force.

[From New England Business Review, April 1963]

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED—PART III, RETRAINING: A GOOD INVESTMENT

Man versus the machine—that old conflict continues to plague our society. It was an important issue in the recent New York newspaper strike. For years it has been a problem to the railroads as well as to countless other industries. The possibility of being displaced strikes fear in the heart of the worker—and not without cause. Yet if displaced workers can find other productive employment, then both society and labor will gain through the production of additional goods and services.

One recent legislative measure passed by Congress to meet the perplexing problem of reemploying displaced labor is the Manpower

Development and Training Act of 1962. The act provides for retraining unemployed workers and for paying them subsistence allowances in lieu of unemployment compensation during the retraining period. In the third year of the program (1964-65) each State will be forced to decide whether to continue this program by matching Federal funds. The administration and Congress also must decide whether to extend the program beyond the originally authorized 3 years.

Some insights can be gained from the Massachusetts experience in retraining during 1960-61. The results of a special survey in this State indicate that retraining expenditures not only serve a justifiable goal but can be also a self-liquidating investment.

SAVINGS THROUGH RETRAINING

The Massachusetts State training program, which is independent of Federal funds, provides for continuing unemployment compensation to workers during retraining.

As part of a joint research project by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, a search was made for unemployment claims filed before, after, and during training by 204 unemployed individuals who took advantage of this program in 1960. The survey showed that until retraining, these workers as a group had become increasingly dependent on unemployment compensation. In 1959, they collected \$24,000 in benefits, 3½ times more than they received in 1956. By 1962, however—after retraining—these workers received only \$8,000 in unemployment compensation.

To be sure that this improvement was not just the result of changing business conditions, the increasing maturity of these workers, or other factors unrelated to retraining, a control group was selected, i.e., a group with similar characteristics but without retraining. This group of identical size was comparable in age, sex, geographic region, previous skill level, and year of unemployment compensation claim.

Although the control group had similar compensation costs in 1959, its cost by 1962 had increased 28 percent. On this basis the retrainees' unemployment costs would probably have amounted to about \$31,000 in 1962 in the absence of retraining. Actually unemployment payments to this group in 1962 were only \$8,000. Thus, for that 1 year, a saving in unemployment compensation of \$23,000 can be attributed to the retraining program.

The outlay on retraining was \$121,000 (net above unemployment compensation which otherwise would have been paid during the retraining period). This experience indicates that the savings in unemployment compensation after retraining were large enough to pay off the entire investment in about 5 years. In business jargon this might be called a payout period.

This estimate (\$121,000 divided by 23,000 equals 5.3 years) does not take account of additional taxes paid by retrained persons after they get new jobs. In the Massachusetts training program, increased tax receipts are estimated to be about as large as the savings in unemployment compensation.

A necessary qualification is the possible displacement of other workers by retrainees. If workers are displaced and collect unemployment compensation, no net savings result. As a safeguard, however, Federal programs require proof of unfilled labor demands in a specific skill before approving such retraining courses.

If this experience is at all representative of the returns on retraining expenditures, it would follow that unemployment compensation funds could pay for the cost of retraining. This is especially true if no other sources of funds were available and if the alternative were no retraining.

² Nineteen percent of employed males as opposed to 29 percent of unemployed moved between March 1959 and March 1960 (U.S. Census).

PROGRAMS IN NEW ENGLAND

Retraining programs are being developed in communities throughout New England. The courses which predominate in the region are machine-tool operators for men and office skills and garment worker skills for women. The region, however, has lost part of its initial retraining lead gained in the first months of the Area Redevelopment Act, which provided training only for depressed areas. New England has 11.6 percent of the retrainees in the two Federal programs—considerable less than the proportion of the Area Redevelopment Act program it had last April (19 percent). In fact, only Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Maine have a proportion of total retrainees greater than their proportion of the U.S. unemployed. As can be seen below, the overall U.S. performance leaves a great deal to be desired.

Cost of unemployment compensation in Massachusetts

[Approximate figures]

| Untrained group: | |
|------------------|----------|
| 1959 | \$21,000 |
| 1962 | 27,000 |
| Retrained group: | |
| 1959 | 25,000 |
| 1962 | 9,000 |

Source: Massachusetts Division of Employment Security.

SLOW START

As shown by the Massachusetts experience retraining is an effective and self-liquidating way of restoring some unemployed to productive activity. How much initial progress has been made with the Federal programs and what are the chances for future expansion? When measured against the volume of unemployment, initial progress in retraining hardly seems impressive. In the United States in 1961, 5.8 million were unemployed 15 weeks or more, with almost 3 million of these out of work more than 6 months. In 1962, the annual average unemployment was about 4 million.

A year after the enactment of the Manpower Act and 7 months after appropriations were approved, only 723 proposals for training 29,300 unemployed had been made throughout the Nation. Of this number plans covering about 24,000 workers have been given final approval. Of course, new programs always start slowly. But with the present rate of proposals covering 3,000 to 4,000 retrainees a month from the 50 States, the current national target of 400,000 retrainees in 3 years hardly seems feasible. Even this target is less than half the original estimate made at the passage of the act.

OBSTACLES TO EXPANSION

Despite signs of promise, general public support, and adequate financing, it will be a long time before a significant part of the program's potential can be developed. There are many obstacles to effective retraining programs.

Facilities: Most retraining is conducted in existing public facilities for vocational education. These facilities are already under pressure from increased population and must expand rapidly just to service daytime high school students. For example, if vocational education is to do its primary job of preparing tomorrow's labor force—as opposed to repairing today's—a 50-percent expansion in vocational high school enrollment in New England might be necessary before 1970.

For retraining purposes, these buildings can be used only at night at least during the school year. If the retraining load is to be expanded, it may prove necessary to find other facilities independent of existing vocational schools. Here full-time instruction would allow more comprehensive training in a shorter time. Combined effort among smaller labor markets in a region might be necessary to fill classes.

Faculty: Increases in vocational education enrollment will put an additional strain on the already overburdened faculty in this field. Competent craftsmen have many attractive alternatives for employment. Not many have had or are willing to obtain teacher training in vocational education, especially for the privilege of earning considerably less than they could earn at their trades. Many vocational schools have found it necessary to hire daytime teachers for a second shift or go directly to industry for instructors for these special retraining programs. Understandably, industry cannot always give up its men for teaching purposes.

The unemployed: Traditional vocational education will meet the needs of only a portion of the unemployed. In Boston recently, an attempt was made by the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security to establish a class for clerk-typists. Letters were sent to 3,500 people who had been seeking jobs in the clerical and sales field within the last year. All these people were under 50 years of age, high school graduates, and at a job skill level below clerk-typist. A substantial number, but not all, were currently unemployed. Only 233 responded to the letter. Of this number, 114 actually appeared for testing, and 77 qualified. But only 35 actually signed up for the course. In other instances, responses to retraining were just as limited. In New Bedford, Mass., 2,000 unemployed had to be screened before 118 interested and suitable candidates for a machine tool operation course could be found. In Detroit, Mich., files of 8,000 women were scanned to find 28 candidates for a course in selling quality ready-to-wear clothing.

It is not surprising that some unemployed are unwilling to take advantage of retraining. Many are merely subject to seasonal layoff, and earn enough while working to be satisfied with their occupations. Others expect to return to their old jobs after business picks up. In some industries undergoing automation, these workers may never be called back, but many are unwilling to recognize this fact even after it is distressingly obvious. Many older workers feel unable to take retraining, or fear going back to school. The U.S. census defines an unemployed person as anyone seeking any type of work, including part-time work. Almost by definition therefore, some unemployed are not seeking work seriously enough to undertake retraining.

There still remains the substantial challenge of retraining those interested and needing such training. This is especially true of the long-term unemployed. Most screening and testing procedures would tend to have a built-in bias against the long-term unemployed. If so, can the problem of the hard-core unemployed be resolved without resorting to a complete rehabilitation program in terms of fundamental education and psychological counseling? Current testing methods classify applicants as eligible or ineligible. The results show that far too many unemployed interested in retraining are not qualified for traditional vocational education. Until retraining programs are well enough developed to offer a comprehensive set of job training alternatives consistent with an individual's potential and interest, a significant dent in the hard-core unemployment problem cannot be made.

There is a conflict between the individual retraining needs of the unemployed and the administrative desire for a few large, well attended courses. Until the administrative problems are solved so that very small groups and even individuals can readily take on-the-job training or training in public and private vocational institutions, the necessary depth and breadth in retraining cannot be provided. The attitude survey reported in the September 1962 issue of the New England Business Review indicates that a broad spectrum of retraining courses will be necessary to tap the latent interest in retraining among the unemployed.

Preliminary programs including the fundamentals of verbal and arithmetic skills, and special courses designed for semi-skilled service occupations (waitress skills, etc.) may have to be instituted for many long-term unemployed. Developing such a program will take time, concern, and imagination at every level of government.

The significant advantage of the Massachusetts program over the Federal programs is that it offers each individual several retraining alternatives. If the Federal programs could adapt the techniques devised for vocational education under the GI bill of rights, this needed individual career counseling might be achieved.

Inertia: Relatively few areas in the United States are really wrestling with this difficult problem. The proposals approved for the two Federal programs have been concentrated in a few States: 42 percent of the retrainees are in 6 States which have only 23 percent of the population. Proposals covering only 3,000 retrainees were submitted to officials of the manpower development program in a recent month by all 50 States.

Training will probably be most fully developed in healthier areas of low unemployment. This will be true for two reasons. First, there are likely to be more job openings to be filled with a retrained person. Second, those regions tend to have better developed vocational education facilities upon which to build a retraining program. In addition, such areas tend to have larger State administrative units and better research facilities to help develop programs. This trend is evident in New England: Connecticut has more than half of all approved New England retrainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act and Area Redevelopment Act. Nationally, nearly half of all authorized Federal retrainees to date are in areas with less than 6 percent unemployment even though the depressed area retraining program was initiated almost a year before the manpower development program. Retraining efforts in depressed areas will be handicapped unless relocation for those unable to find local jobs is encouraged. In these places, many retraining courses cannot be justified unless job openings outside the area are considered.

NEEDED: A BROADER APPROACH

Retraining cannot be expanded enough to provide employment for everyone. This program cannot be the Government's only weapon in its war on unemployment. The proposed Federal income tax cut is an example of a more comprehensive approach. Efforts to increase aggregate demand should provide opportunities for many unemployed without retraining. In a faster growing economy, management would have to be less selective in its hiring practices.

Nevertheless, retraining can provide an inexpensive method for helping a significant number of the unemployed help themselves. It is a partial answer to a perplexing problem which has no easy solution.

U.S.-FINANCED MOTELS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee on which I serve just recently passed out of committee H.R.

1996 which increases authorizations to the area redevelopment administration in the amount of \$455 million. I do not approve of the manner in which this program is being administered, at least not in the State of Michigan. The Activity Summary Report, dated Monday, March 25, 1963, covering operations in fiscal 1963 to that date, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, indicates that seven so-called industrial loans have been made in Michigan in the total amount of \$4.4 million. I point out, however, that a reading of the report indicates that 86 percent of this money, or \$3.8 million went to finance new motels. I do not believe this was the intent of Congress. To supplement these remarks, I call to the attention of all Members the story appearing in the Sunday, May 5, 1963, issue of the Detroit Free Press, by Frank Beckman, entitled "Motel Man Rips Competition From U.S. Aided Inns," set forth below:

MOTEL MAN RIPS COMPETITION FROM U.S.-AIDED INNS

(By Frank Beckman)

A Detroit motel operator has protested to Congress that Area Redevelopment Act loans are being issued for construction of hotels and motels which compete with establishments built without Federal aid.

Peter Solomon said this has the effect of using tax money paid by hostelry owners to subsidize "unfair competition."

He said owners who have their own capital invested in their businesses should not be confronted by competition made possible by Area Redevelopment Act loans.

Solomon's protest was made to Michigan Senators PHILIP A. HART and PATRICK V. McNAMARA and to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, and Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican of Wyoming.

DOUGLAS is chairman of the manpower stabilization subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering expansion of the Area Redevelopment Act program. SIMPSON is a subcommittee member.

Solomon, operator and part owner of the Diplomat Motel, 5801 Woodward, and the Goldenaire Motel, 18650 Woodward, asked to appear before the committee to state his protest.

According to Solomon, the Area Redevelopment Act program makes it possible for persons to go into the hotel and motel business at no risk of their own capital.

"It is not right that the Government should be supplying money while other hotel and motel owners arranged their own financing and now have to put up with new competition," he said.

Area Redevelopment Act loans have been approved for the Pontchartrain Hotel, West Jefferson and Washington Boulevard; the London Inn Motel, Woodward and Stimson; and a proposed motel on West Grand Boulevard across from the General Motors Building.

Area Redevelopment Act loans also have been approved for numerous other private, commercial and industrial projects in the Detroit area.

Under the area redevelopment law, enacted 2 years ago, investors can qualify for Federal loans of as much as 65 percent of project cost.

To do so, 10 percent of the needed capital must be obtained from a local citizens' corporation. The remainder would come from other lending sources or the developers' capital.

The local citizens' corporation is the Detroit Metropolitan Industrial Development Corp., known as Demico, which was estab-

lished so Detroit could qualify for Area Redevelopment Act benefits.

Last Wednesday, Mayor Cavanagh appeared before the Douglas subcommittee to urge expansion of the Area Redevelopment Act program.

Since the program was established, loans of about \$2.5 million in Detroit have stimulated \$13 million in new projects, he said.

LABOR PROBLEMS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was inserted in one of the daily newspapers here in Washington a public announcement by a long-established and respected labor union in the State of Texas.

The public announcement was carried in the press as an advertisement, and in a sense it was one, for it called attention to the peculiar jungle of legalisms and contradictory policies that are set aside in our country to regulate that area generally referred to as labor problems.

There was something plaintive about this notice or advertisement. It should be listened to by this Congress.

Does it not strike one as strange that, with all the machinery of government we have in this land, with all the agencies and bureaus and proliferation of personnel with hands on the pulse of the citizenry, here is a Texas local union that feels compelled to buy commercial space in a Washington newspaper in order to get the ear of this Government?

This local union, Local 4-367 of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers, which has a membership scattered over the face of our State, was endeavoring to recite a grievance 2,200 of its refinery worker members have against a foreign corporation doing business in our country, the Royal Dutch/Shell combine, second largest oil company in the world.

I have made it my business to learn something about this situation. I feel that it underscores some of the inadequacies and confusions that pass for labor law and labor policies in this country.

I know little about the Shell Oil Co. I do know that it has had a paid lobbyist who has dutifully filed a report after interceding with the Congress on some matters. I know very little of what this foreign combine has petitioned the Congress to consider, and I do not know what consideration was given. But I do know something about the plight of 2,200 of our citizens who are in their eighth month of a strike against this company. I know something of this because I went to Texas and found out for myself.

What I learned is an old story in my State. I say in my State, for the situation for labor unions there is considerably different from that of other industrial States.

Labor unions in Texas have had many odds weighed against them. They

must organize and operate in a legal and governmental climate that militates against their every move. In the rash of antilabor passions after the last war, Texas, which had only begun its rapid urbanization, led the Nation in the passage of legislation calculated to make the growth and effectiveness of unions as difficult as possible. These laws have had their effect. Today less than 19 percent of Texas nonfarm workers are engaged in collective bargaining with their employees. And today is almost 30 years after a previous Congress established the certification of collective bargaining as the public policy and the law of the land.

But 30 years ago the members of the local union I discuss today did succeed in laying hold to their right to bargain with the foreign interests for whom they worked. Today, they are utterly frustrated in that effort, and I see no law or policy of this Government moving to restore sense to the situation.

It is a mystery to me how a group of workers can succeed in attracting governmental concern. By what formula should they proceed?

If they harbor crooks or racketeers in their midst, there is an agency that registers its concern.

If they shut down the world's largest harbor, they attract attention.

If they play second fiddle in a symphony, they get the personalized attention of the Secretary of Labor.

If they put out important newspapers, the Government moves so quickly as to be precipitous.

If they sell peanuts at a ball park they get every facility of Government opened quickly to effect a settlement.

But suppose they are merely 2,200 highly skilled oil refinery workers who have this bear of automation breathing down their necks? What do they do?

For 8½ months they have struck saying they want this corporation to sit down and bargain in good faith. Who is listening?

The NLRB? Yes, it is listening, but what has been forthcoming? Charges have been filed and one would think there might be some urgency to dispose of those charges, except that under our laws the problems of 2,200 workers without income get no priority.

I have seen more efforts at unionization die in Texas while the formal charges and complaints involved were hanging upon the NLRB drying rack awaiting that justice that so often is delayed to the point of denial.

A labor dispute is a volatile situation for both management and labor. But no attention is being given to perfecting means for their early resolution. Such a dispute is not like other civil matters in which a citizen can get damages along with redress when he eventually has his day in court. There is nothing to be done to rectify a lost bargaining position or a destroyed organization when complaints are not handled in a timely manner. Things cannot be put back like they were, and hence delay becomes a partisan of one side at the bargaining table.

This is what is happening to these oil workers in Texas. If they sound plaintive, it is because they should be confused, and they must be uncertain when their own job security is the issue in this strike. They are confronted by a confusion and an uncertainty in the Government's own policies that affect their situation.

Months ago I wrote the then Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, to inquire what was the Government's policy about purchasing from plants involved in labor dispute. I pointed out that Federal law prohibits a State employment commission from referring a job applicant to a plant involved in a labor dispute, but it does not keep a Government purchasing agent from going behind a picket line to contract for such supplies as it wishes. Secretary Goldberg told me he had appointed a task force to study this matter and to recommend a policy.

After Secretary Wirtz assumed the duties of that Department, I inquired of him as to the work of this task force. He assured me the matter was being pursued but no report has been forthcoming. This has been a year. Before too long, the Shell employees will have been out a year. How much longer will they have to wait to learn if the Government has a fixed policy to guide the Secretary of the Navy in the purchase of petroleum products from this or any other struck plants where unresolved charges of law violations are pending while workers go without pay.

We are considering here only one strike that involves perhaps 10,000 workers and their families. This is of no small consequence. I know few things that should be more demanding on the time of the administration, its Department of Labor, and this Congress. This contest between American workers and this foreign corporation turns on the question of job security.

No one here can blame this corporation for wanting to improve its competitive position, if that is its purpose in this strike; no one can blame these workers for resisting what amounts to a sudden-death blow to many of their futures. The corporation, which must under law guarantee lifetime security to its employees in some of the lands where it operates, is telling some 400 of these Texas workers that "after 10 or more years of your labor, we have no place for you, we owe you nothing further."

This is a grim situation, surely as grim as that of the peanut vendors at the Washington ball park, where the Secretary of Labor offered his good offices with such dispatch. This Department of Labor and the administration have many resources and contain many thoughtful persons. This corporation and these employees are locked in a struggle that may well extend into areas where the customary rituals of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service are of little help in affecting a settlement.

The New York Times last month printed a thoughtful article on the transitions and changes that are developing in the processes of labor negotiations. Secretary Willard Wirtz was quoted as

saying that creative bargaining was replacing the more primitive kind of labor-management relations. One of the elements of this emerging process was suggested as the new role of Government, "with the Labor Department working with the negotiators to provide studies of complicated problems and retraining programs to help workers faced with displacement to obtain new jobs."

I am glad the Times finds this trend, but we have not seen it in Texas. We have not seen it in any of the responses from this Department on the Shell dispute. If there are thoughts or resources available in this emerging role from the Department, or in the newly created Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, why have they not been offered to this company and its employees? Whatever talents they may have beyond that of simply measuring the damage and displacements of this thing we call automation could never be better applied than right now in Texas where for over 8 months this impasse has existed on this very issue.

If the Government has no role in this dispute or nothing to offer to these adversaries, then you can be confident that it really has nothing to meet these same challenges when they wrack the economy of your own State. If this be so, we can ask if we have really done anything meaningful to prepare for the impact of those technological changes that have already transformed the oil refining industry.

I raise these matters as a question. If it is not answered in the instant case you can be sure you will be on this floor at some future point raising the same questions. At such time you, too, will be wondering about any indifference to these growing problems. Should your situation be similar to the one I describe, you might even wish to inquire of the Secretary of State if his good offices could be utilized to assist American citizens who try to exercise their right to bargain with the foreign and artificial corporate persons doing business in our country, such as Royal Dutch/Shell.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED SERVICE CONTRACTS ACT OF 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide labor standards protection for the employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing services or maintenance work to the Federal agencies. The service contract is the only major category of Federal contracts to which labor standards are not generally applicable.

While no precise estimate of the number or dollar volume of service contracts entered into by the Federal agencies is available, they account for a substantial

part of Federal contracting activity. They cover a large variety of common needs, including such services as custodial or maintenance, elevator, refuse collection, exterminating, cooking, waiter or dishwashing, laundry, clerical, installation and repair of mechanical and electrical equipment, transporting and printing.

Many of the employees engaged in performing these services are poorly paid. Their wages generally do not compare favorably with the rates paid in other industries. A recent occupational earnings study of the contract cleaning services industry, conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that the average earnings for men and women engaged in these services are as low as \$1.07 and \$1.13 an hour in some metropolitan areas. Consequently, the need for minimum wage standards protection for this group is particularly acute.

This need is especially apparent when the earnings of persons employed on service contracts are compared with the wages and benefits which had been paid Federal employees who formerly performed the same services. There has been vehement criticism not only of decreased wage rates but also of the reduction in fringe benefits which have become of major importance in the earnings structure.

The basic objective of my bill is to place the employees of service contractors in the same position with respect to wages as they would be if they were employees of the Government. Substantively, it provides that certain stipulations regarding wages and working conditions shall be included in both negotiated and advertised contracts in excess of \$2,000 providing for the furnishing of services or maintenance work to a Federal agency. The requirements are not applicable, however, to certain types of contracts, including contracts subject to either the Davis-Bacon Act or the Walsh-Healey Act, contracts of certain common carriers, communications companies, and public utilities, and employment contracts of Federal employees.

The requirements are applicable only to employees in positions of the type covered by the Wage Board procedure; that is, those in trades or crafts or in manual labor occupations, including supervisory positions in which trade, craft, or laboring experience is the paramount requirement. They also apply only to services performed within the United States.

The stipulations to be incorporated in the contracts require that persons engaged to furnish services or maintenance work be paid no less than the contracting agency pays its own employees under the Wage Board procedures applicable to blue collar workers. In addition, the contractor must provide his employees with fringe benefits equivalent to those received by Government employees or pay them the cash equivalent of these fringe benefits. This assures that employees furnishing services by contract with the United States shall be in the same position as they would be if they were directly hired by the United States to perform these services.

Additional stipulations require that services or maintenance work shall not be performed under unsafe or unsanitary working conditions where those working conditions are under the control of the contractor. The contractor is also required to notify the employees of the benefits due them under the act, either by written notices or by posting in the place where the work is to be performed.

For the purpose of administration and enforcement, the stipulations authorize the withholding from the contractor of accrued payments necessary to pay covered workers the differences between the wages and value of benefits required by the contract and those actually paid. The contracting officer's decision to withhold payments may be appealed to the head of the agency whose decision is conclusive upon all Federal agencies and, if supported by substantial evidence, conclusive in any court in the United States. In the event of violation, the contract may be terminated and the contractor held liable for any resulting cost to the Government.

The bill authorizes and directs the Comptroller General to pay directly to the persons underpaid the wages and value of benefits which the contracting agencies have found to be due under the act. If the withheld sums are not sufficient to make the employees whole, the United States may bring an action against the contractor or any sureties to recover the remaining amount of underpayments. The bill also provides a procedure for blacklisting for a period of 3 years those contractors who violate the act.

The Secretary of Labor is given authority to assure coordination of the administration of the provisions of the act and to make reasonable limitations and exceptions.

The Secretary is also authorized to make exceptions with respect to specific contracts and to modify existing contracts when such action is in the public interest. In addition, the Secretary may provide reasonable limitations and make regulations allowing variations and exemptions to the act.

NORTHROP CORP. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE FIELD OF LAMINAR FLOW CONTROL

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be of interest to my distinguished colleagues to provide them with some information on the latest research and development being conducted by the Northrop Corp., of Hawthorne, Calif.

Among many other projects now under study and test by the Norair Division

of Northrop Corp. is the development of the U.S. Air Force X-21A aircraft.

This revolutionary research plane may well be the greatest advance in aerodynamic flight since the jet engine. Strictly a military project now, the experiment has enormous commercial possibilities particularly on transcontinental and intercontinental flights, and in the supersonic-transport field.

Two demonstration aircraft, former Air Force Douglas WB-66's have been extensively modified and designated as experimental X-21A aircraft.

They are designed to test the feasibility of a suction system to maintain laminar air flow over the wings. This is the first large scale attempt to reduce friction drag by this method.

I do not wish to confuse my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, with complicated and abstract engineering terms. As simply as possible this concept, laminar flow control—LFC—seeks to eliminate friction drag resulting from turbulent airflow over aircraft surfaces. This friction drag has robbed airplanes of speed and range since the dawn of aviation. On modern jetliners it accounts for about half the total drag experienced in flight.

To reduce this drag, X-21A wings will "inhale" surface air through tiny slots and expel the air to the rear. This prevents the buildup of turbulence and allows a smooth, friction free flow of air adjacent to the wings. A pumping system mounted inside the wings is used to suck air through the slots.

X-21A flight tests are expected to prove that up to 80 percent of airplane friction drag can be eliminated with a corresponding increase in range, endurance or payload of more than 50 percent.

Northrop's laminar flow control program is being conducted under contract with the U.S. Air Force Systems Command. This program includes research in supersonic laminar flow control techniques as well as subsonic applications to shapes other than wings.

Interestingly enough, Northrop began its pioneer work in this area as far back as 1949 when Dr. Werner Pfenninger, a Swiss scientist known internationally for his studies in this field, joined the company staff. Today, Northrop is the only company in this country conducting research into laminar flow control.

Mr. Speaker, the end product of all this experimental and scientific development will be a vastly improved military capacity for our Air Force. Laminar flow control transport planes will be able to fly much longer distances overseas without refueling. More troops and supplies could be carried than the conventional aircraft in use today can handle. Dependence on oversea bases would be decreased.

Laminar flow control aircraft could cruise outside the limits and interceptor range of a potential aggressor, ready to launch a missile counterstrike the instant the United States or its allies were attacked. Equipped with submarine detection equipment and air-to-sub surface missiles, long range laminar flow control aircraft could increase aircraft

participation in antisubmarine defense at low cost to the taxpayer.

I would like to commend both the U.S. Air Force and the Northrop Corp. for their work in the field of laminar flow control. Our citizens can be assured that the brilliant scientists of Northrop, and the dedicated career officers of the U.S. Air Force are maintaining a close and continuing interest in the field of research and development. Our Nation's security and safety is clearly in good hands. Mr. Speaker, a resounding "well done" is due to all those persons participating in this program.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate on Wednesday, May 8, and Thursday, May 9, 1963.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WATSON (at the request of Mr. DORN), for May 6, 1963, on account of illness of staff member.

Mr. CONTE, until May 13, on account of official business (travel with Treasury and Post Office Committee).

Mr. GARY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for the week of May 6, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. FINO (at the request of Mr. ARENDTS), for the balance of this week on account of death in the family.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina), for May 6, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON), on account of illness in the family.

Mr. STEED (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), from today, May 6, through Monday, May 13, on account of official business (Treasury and Post Office subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee).

Mr. FORRESTER (at the request of Mr. WELTNER), for today, May 6, through Saturday, May 11, on account of illness.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for Monday, May 6, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next, May 8, 1963.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FARSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT of Florida, in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include an address by the President of the United States, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$240.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McLOSKEY.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. SHORT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REUSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. PUCINSKI in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 762. An act to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords with resulting complete aphonia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes, p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

766. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the excessive cost of leasing compared with buying certain electronic data processing equipment by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

767. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857, 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

768. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

769. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

770. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5497. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of Conference. H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 275). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 4996. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6009. A bill to provide, for the periods ending June 3, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6041. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as

amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 6042. A bill to repeal certain manufacturers' excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 6043. A bill to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses and losses and damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6044. A bill to amend section 104(b) (5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6045. A bill to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6046. A bill to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6047. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6048. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to practice of law and participation in enterprise by justices or judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 6049. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6050. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 6051. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 6052. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6053. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6054. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 6055. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence,

R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6056. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6057. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any Armed Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6058. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 6059. A bill to exempt from compulsory coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6060. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6061. A bill to extend and improve the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6062. A bill to amend Public Law 87-276, so as to extend its provisions for three additional years, to expand the program under that act to provide for the training of teachers of all exceptional children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 6063. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to remove the 5 percent limitation on expenditures for youth training programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 6064. A bill to amend section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for a study by the Secretary of Labor of the military manpower needs of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 6065. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6066. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1920 with respect to the rates of duty on brooms made of broomcorn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6067. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 6068. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide annuities for dependent parents of deceased unmarried employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6069. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income tax purposes certain special assessments and other charges made

against him or his property under local law without regard to whether they tend to increase the value of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6071. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6072. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6073. A bill to amend section 103(d) of title 23 of the United States Code, to authorize the designation of an additional 2,000 miles of interstate highways in redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6074. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide Federal assistance for projects for the acquisition of equipment to be used for shared-time secondary educational programs in science, mathematics, and modern foreign language, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6075. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to give its protection to employees of certain large hotels, motels, restaurants, and laundries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6076. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6077. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of individuals irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 6078. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication service or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6079. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the determination of annual income for the year in which initial entitlement of pension occurs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6080. A bill to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6081. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to require that postage stamps in the Canal Zone shall bear no legend other than the words "Canal Zone," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6082. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6083. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6084. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent

and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 6085. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on the taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to enter into an agreement concerning bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 6086. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadrcentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6087. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6088. A bill to provide wage standards for persons engaged by Federal contractors or subcontractors to furnish services or maintenance work to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 6089. A bill 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6090. A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to eligibility to the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.J. Res. 399. Joint resolution to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the rate structure applicable to the shipment by railroad of grain in carload lots from the upper Midwest region of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution reaffirming deep interest of the United States in preserving the peace, stability and freedom of the independent nations and peoples in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution reaffirming deep interest of the United States in preserving the peace, stability and freedom of the independent nations and peoples in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARSTEIN:

H. Res. 333. Resolution concerning collective defense agreements with Israel; to be Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. SENNER: Memorial of the Arizona House of Representatives requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in

Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Morro Bay Rock; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the appropriation of sufficient funds to the U.S. Public Health Service to enable the Federal Government to match available local funds to the maximum extent possible under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the additional appropriation necessary to complete the Federal accelerated public works program for the restoration of the City of Refuge National Historical Park on the Island of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the establishment of military bases and units on the neighbor islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant Federal aid or assistance to urban and metropolitan mass transportation facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being in favor of the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the recital of voluntary prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from \$1,200 to \$2,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for public assistance for mental and tubercular patients in public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting favorable action upon pending legislation exempting certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products and passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6091. A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6092. A bill for the relief of Alexander Haytko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6093. A bill for the relief of Lee Chung Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6094. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 6095. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Conti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6096. A bill for the relief of Royce C. Plume, a member of the Arapahoe Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 6097. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 6098. A bill for the relief of Lino Tuomaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6099. A bill for the relief of Shirley Shapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 6100. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Laing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6101. A bill for the relief of Arminda P. Viseu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6102. A bill for the relief of CWO Christian J. Klett; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6103. A bill for the relief of Helene Auguste Marie Niesel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 6104. A bill for the relief of Markos J. Janavaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 6105. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marija Justinich and her minor daughter, Bozica Justinich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6106. A bill for the relief of James S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

106. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Elmer L. Sharp of Forest Grove, and others, urging the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

107. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Hume Logan and other citizens of Louisville, Ky., relative to the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

108. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Maureen Koltugin and others, San Francisco, Calif., relative to preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

109. Also, petition of Allen J. Packer and others, Redwood City, Calif., relative to preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

110. Also, petition of W. R. Amidon, president, New England Standardbred Breeders Association, Inc., Salem Depot, N.H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the Congressmen of the six New England States be urged to seek the repeal of the proposal ruling of the Federal Communications Commission banning the broadcasting and televising of horseracing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

111. Also, petition of John J. Shaughnessy, Brooklyn, N.Y., calling attention to his "open letter to President Kennedy" which was published in the April 10, 1963 daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A2193-A2194, relating to his allegations that the President is apathetic and indifferent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

112. Also, petition of William Newell, post commander, Marathon Memorial Post No. 154, Marathon, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the enactment of legislation which would name the veterans' hospital to be built in Miami, Dade County, Fla., as the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 3: Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, just about 15 years after our Declaration of Independence, and not quite 2 years after the United States of America adopted

our first Constitution, Poland signed its Constitution, on May 3, 1791.

In its Constitution, Poland incorporated enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. The Polish people thus demonstrated their love and attachment to freedom and independence—just as we, the American people did when we declared our independence from a mother country who practiced tyranny, and signed our famous Constitution "to promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness."

We, therefore, can fully appreciate and sympathize with the great longing of the peoples of Poland for freedom and independence, to live and to worship their God as they choose.

We, therefore, are honored and happy to join the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. This marks a time in the history of that great country when subservience to a foreign rule became unbearable. Poland had attempted several times before that to break the yoke of oppression placed upon her shoulders by Russia. In

1794 the Kosciuszko uprising took place; in 1831, the November uprising took place; then in 1944 the Warsaw uprising against German occupation took place—but of all these, the 1863 uprising against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in Polish history, spanning over 2 years.

This was one of the most costly uprisings—in terms of Polish people killed, captured, or deported to cruel Siberian mines. It brought about a ruthless and continuing attempt by the Russians to completely remove all traces of the hated Polish national spirit; by confiscation of private property; by destroying the Polish economy; by arresting and deporting many of its most influential citizens; and even by banning the Polish language from offices and schools.

We know this type of tyranny over a nation cannot possibly be successful as long as its citizens can recall days of freedom, days of independence of heart and spirit, days of honor, and days of happiness. In joining with Polish people everywhere in celebration of her national holiday, we are thus helping her remember a glorious past—and helping her cherish the hope that one day there will be a ceasing of tyranny, and Poland will rise again as a free and independent nation.

When Poland adopted its Constitution on May 3, 1791—this was during a time in history when representative self-government, justice for all, freedom to worship, and freedom to live without fear was unheard of in European countries—who were still in the grip of autocratic rulers. Many of those countries are still in the grip of a ruthless and autocratic ruler—and we join with the Polish, and with other nations, in believing that ultimately justice will prevail and the pitiless grip of a godless communism will be loosened and completely removed.

A famous Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, John Jay, once spoke words which I feel should offer comfort and hope, and give courage to the Polish people:

God is great, and therefore He will be sought; He is good, and therefore He will be found.

If in the day of sorrow we own God's presence in the cloud, we shall find Him also in the pillar of fire, brightening and cheering our way as the night comes on.

In all his dispensations God is at work for our good. In prosperity, He tries our gratitude; in mediocrity, our contentment; in misfortune, our submission; in darkness, our faith; under temptation, our steadfastness; and at all times, our obedience and trust in Him.

God governs the world, and we have only to do our duty wisely, and leave the issue to Him.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years the U.S. Congress has annually demonstrated the feeling of faithful

friendship on the part of the American people toward the Polish nation and people through special commemoration of Poland's great Constitution of 1791.

Beginning on May 3, and continuing throughout the month, Poles and citizens of Polish origin in America celebrate their Polish 3d of May Constitution holiday. Wherever Americans of Polish extraction live, this event is marked with special exercises to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism and freedom in Europe.

It was on May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution in 1789, that Poland, without a bloody revolution or even without disorder, succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But following the unfortunate path down which history has led the Polish people for so long, this great rebirth and assertion of the rights of man came too late to forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The greatness of the May 3 Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles have raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their other glorious victories in their centuries-old struggle for freedom.

The right of man to freedom was formulated in these words in the 3d of May Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Meditation on the words of that Constitution reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice and freedom for the Polish people even though their nation has since World War II been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and territory by Soviet Russia.

Exchange of Letters on the Balance of Payments With Secretary of the Treasury Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 I addressed a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, making certain observations about special transactions devised by the administration in order to show an apparent improvement in the balance of payments in 1962, as well as to ease the immediate problem of the outflow of gold. It was my conclusion that without the use of these new and unique

transactions—which in my opinion constitute a form of borrowing from the future—the balance of payments in 1962 might have shown a deficit of from \$3 to \$3.6 billion, instead of the \$2.2 billion deficit actually recorded. I am not condemning the use of these techniques, but I hope that complete information about them can be put on the record so that the Congress can judge their usefulness as well as what real improvement in our balance of payments may have taken place over the past several years.

Secretary Dillon has now responded to my letter and affirmed that my understanding of these transactions is correct. However, because the Secretary's letter sheds little light on these transactions, I have written to him again, asking for additional information. In order that those who are interested in this problem have the benefit of the information and comments contained in the correspondence, I have asked unanimous consent that the exchange of letters between myself and the Secretary be included in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Part of the reason for the apparent improvement in the U.S. balance of payments over the past 2 years has been advance debt repayments by foreign governments of about \$700 million in both 1961 and 1962. To the extent that advance repayments improve our current payments position, they eliminate a source of balance-of-payments credits in future years when the debts normally would have been paid. In this sense, foreign debt prepayments represent borrowing from the future.

It is my understanding that in 1962 the administration began using a number of additional techniques based upon the same principle of borrowing from the future in order to improve the current balance-of-payments position. Without the use of these new techniques, excluding debt prepayments, it is my impression that the balance-of-payments deficit in 1962 would have been as much as \$3 billion, instead of the \$2.2 billion reported. If debt prepayments also are considered, the deficit would have been over \$3.6 billion or about as much as the average in the 1958-60 period.

Since these techniques have received little or no public attention, there is a widespread impression that our balance-of-payments position is steadily improving. In order that the Congress and the public have a clear idea of what progress actually is being made, I wish to set forth my understanding of these techniques and to ask for your comment.

One of the new techniques being employed is the sale to foreign governments of non-marketable U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies. This technique accounted for an improvement in the balance-of-payments last year of \$250 million. In 1963, an additional \$279 million of these obligations have been sold. When these obligations are finally paid off, there will be an equivalent debit item in our balance-of-payments.

Another new technique which temporarily improved the balance-of-payments in 1962 by as much as \$460 million, was the firm commitment of foreign funds for military purchases in the United States. This was achieved when the German Government, on January 1, 1962, deposited this amount to the credit of the U.S. Government. These

funds, which were set aside for the eventual purchase of military supplies and equipment, thus showed up as a credit in the U.S. balance-of-payments in advance of firm orders for the equipment and supplies. Normally the German payments would have appeared as a credit only after the equipment and supplies had been actually ordered or delivered. To the extent that this is the case, any improvement in the balance-of-payments in 1962 from this source was at the expense of the balance-of-payments in a later year.

Finally, the balance of payments appears improved by about \$100 million because the United States has paid its subscriptions to certain international organizations as they came due, not in dollars, but in non-interest-bearing, nonmarketable securities. Sometime in the future, the international organizations will exchange these for dollars. In other words, the debit in our international payments represented by these subscriptions has been postponed from 1962 until a subsequent year.

I will appreciate having your comments on these observations.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 11, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I am happy to reply to your letter of April 2.

The data on special transactions as given in your letter are of course correct. As you may know, the March 1963 issue of the Commerce Department's Survey of Current Business, published in the past few days, notes these various factors and discusses their effect on our balance of payments. Through this and other means we would hope that such information is receiving wide circulation, and thus helping to bring to the public generally a full appreciation of our balance-of-payments problem.

The receipt items you mentioned in your letter reduced our liquid liabilities to foreigners. The overall balance-of-payments deficit, measuring our gold losses and the changes in our liquid liabilities to foreigners, reflected this situation accordingly. The \$100 million outpayments item, representing certain subscriptions to international organizations in the form of non-interest-bearing notes, appears as a capital outflow in the balance of payments but will affect the deficit or change our liquid liabilities only when and as it is converted to dollars and spent abroad rather than in the United States.

There are, of course, special factors of this or other kinds almost every year. Very often, as you know, the comments that accompany publication of the balance-of-payments schedule call special attention to these items affecting individual categories or the payments schedule as a whole. You will recall the large amount of sales of jet aircraft and cotton sales in 1960 which was noted, at that time, as giving exports an unusual boost over the previous year. In 1959, a number of special factors were noted and included in the \$435 million of debt prepayments which helped reduce the deficit that year.

In my view, these special transactions should not be considered as borrowing from the future. There are a number of contingent items which, in some sense, relate to the future both on the assets and on the liabilities side. For example, our balance-of-payments deficit does not take into account the claims we are accumulating from the large outflows of U.S. capital, and such claims on the asset side are not stressed. Insofar as military offset arrangements are concerned, including advanced military payments, they do reduce the liquid liabilities of the United States since the funds are earmarked mainly against firm

orders and are solely for military purchases in the United States. They represent, of course, the result of our efforts to offset our military expenditures abroad by specific arrangements for increased sales to those countries of U.S. military equipment.

But, in my view, the important and significant question deserving particular attention involves the amount of our payments balance that must be financed in one way or another over a given period. This question of financing seems to me to focus attention on the present problem and to center concern properly on the need to effect those correctives which alone can provide real and lasting improvement.

As you are aware, we are pressing forward on all fronts to gain those correctives; we shall, indeed we must, gain them. But the process will take time and the objective of a balanced payments position cannot be predicated in any precise sense. This is so because we rely on the operation of free markets. The program we follow includes such fundamental factors as responsible public and private effort to restrain wage and price levels, the appropriate influence of interest rate levels, export expansion and the fostering of an increasingly favorable investment climate at home.

While these forces continue to work to correct the situation, we have taken various measures both to curb Government spending of dollars abroad and to meet financing needs. In bridging the gap before balance is attained in ways consistent with a free trade and payments system, a whole complex of arrangements has been devised to assure that confidence in the payments system and in the U.S. dollar are maintained. I think that our efforts along this line have been quite successful in preventing speculative outbursts and in avoiding any disorderly exchange markets. This was the experience at the time of the stock market disturbances last spring, during the Canadian exchange crisis, and again during the Cuban showdown last year. In the process, the payments system has been buttressed by a series of financial arrangements designed to forestall or cope with any such pressures.

We must, of course, continue every urgent effort to overcome our balance-of-payments problem and thus, to bring to a halt the persistent deficits that have characterized our payments position for too many years. With this thought that your letter conveys, I most heartily agree.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of April 11 in which you comment on questions about certain special transactions in our balance of payments which I raised in a letter to you of April 2.

I have noted the article in the March issue of the Survey of Current Business to which you referred. While passing reference was made to the special transactions in which I am interested, both the article and your letter do little more than arouse in me a desire to know much more about them.

I am, of course, pleased to know that my general understanding of these transactions is correct, but I would appreciate it if you could send me detailed information about them and the underlying circumstances. The specific transactions in which I am interested include:

1. The sale to foreign governments of non-marketable U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies;

2. The advance commitment of foreign funds for military purchases in the United States; and

3. The net transfer of non-interest-bearing, nonmarketable securities to certain international organizations as part of our capital subscriptions pending their need for cash.

Besides detailed information on these transactions, I would like the Treasury's estimate of what the balance-of-payments deficit would have been in 1962 without the use of these techniques as well as without the use of foreign debt prepayments.

In addition, I would like to know how the use of each of these techniques in 1962 will affect our balance of payments in later years.

Finally, with regard to (1) above, I would appreciate knowing the authority under which the Treasury is incurring nondollar debt and how this nondollar debt relates to the debt ceiling.

You make the point in your letter that "a whole complex of arrangements has been devised to assure that confidence in the payments system and in the U.S. dollar are maintained." It is precisely this "complex of arrangements" that interests me and that prompted my earlier letter.

It strikes me that unlike other special factors which affect the balance of payments almost every year, to which you referred, the special transactions about which I asked were devised by the administration in order to create an apparent improvement in the balance of payments in 1962 as well as to ease the immediate problem of the outflow of gold.

It is my impression, therefore, that the conscious use by the administration of these special transactions reduced our balance-of-payments deficit significantly below what it would have otherwise been. Because of the nature of these transactions, it is also my impression that—like foreign debt prepayments—they represent a form of borrowing from the future.

I do not say that these transactions are undesirable. But I do believe that much more needs to be known about them before a judgment can be made and before it is clear what real improvement, if any, has been made in solving our balance-of-payments problem.

In view of the national interest in maintaining confidence in the dollar, I understand that this may be a sensitive area. At the same time, however, I believe that a clearer understanding of these transactions and their effects is important for the development of sound public policy.

As you know, the Joint Economic Committee is scheduling full committee hearings on the balance of payments next month or early in June. Your response to this letter and the testimony which will be given at these hearings should serve the highly useful function of shedding some needed light on these subjects.

With best wishes,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, Friday last, observance was made that this date marked the 172d year the

Constitution of Poland has been in existence.

The Polish Constitution was adopted in 1791, just 2 years after our own. Throughout these many years our two countries have had much in common and so, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with many Members on both sides of the aisle in paying honor to a gallant nation.

The Polish people, time and time again, have translated their belief in the democratic faith expressed in their Constitution.

In honoring freedom fighters of the past we wish to convey added strength to freedom fighters of the present. Today the people of Poland are still the oppressed captives of communism, but their hopes, their dreams, their courage has never faltered and we commend them for this spirit.

Hope is ever present in their hearts and we join with them in the fervent wish that the principles upon which their Constitution was based will soon be restored to the Polish people.

As we pay tribute to the people of Poland and commemorate Polish Constitution Day, let us all rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom and to the philosophy of self-determination for all people.

Combat Pay Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, together with a substantial number of Congressmen who have already indicated their active support, others may wish to join in coauthoring a combat pay amendment proposed to H.R. 5555, the military pay raise bill. The suggested amendment was requested by the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, and the Bureau of the Budget, and was approved by the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which held exhaustive hearings in studying and recommending this proposal.

The subcommittee proposal was not as broad as the Department of Defense, Army, and Bureau of the Budget proposal in that it did not cover times of actual declared war, being restricted to the present undeclared military combat operations in southeast Asia and any similar situation determined by the Department of Defense. The full committee struck the entire proposal from the subcommittee recommendations. The following amendment is the language approved by the subcommittee, being not quite as generous as the administration proposal. The amount of \$55 was set because of this being the minimum amount of any unusual pay given for the many other things that have unusual pay added to basic pay.

The amendment which is expected to be offered on the floor is, therefore, no

more generous than requested by the administration and is substantially in the exact terms of the administration proposal, being identically the language approved by the subcommittee which studied the matter. The precise language is as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF H.R. 5555

Insert the following new section at the end of the bill:

"SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE"

"SEC. 14. (a) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) The following new section is added after section 399:

" '310 Special pay; duty subject to hostile fire

" '(a) Except in time of war declared by Congress, and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service may be paid special pay at the rate of \$55 a month for any month in which he was entitled to basic pay and in which he—

" '(1) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

" '(2) was on duty in an area in which he was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period he was on duty in that area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; or

" '(3) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

" 'A member covered by clause (3) who is hospitalized for the treatment of his injury or wound may be paid special pay under this section for not more than three additional months during which he is so hospitalized.

" '(b) A member may not be paid more than one special pay under this section for any month. A member may be paid special pay under this section in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

" '(c) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

" '(d) The Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress by March 1 of each year on the administration of this section during the preceding calendar year."

"(2) The following new item is inserted in the analysis: '310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire.'

"(b) The Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 (50 App. U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is repealed."

The Need for the Captive Nations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations had received tremendous bipartisan endorsement. I am happy to report today that the active and well-

organized American-Lithuanian community swung behind the resolution. The leading figures in American-Lithuanian political activities, meeting in a conference in Chicago, Ill., on April 19-20, voted unanimously to support, by all means at their disposal, the establishment of such a committee.

I would like to quote at this point from an editorial that appeared on April 26, 1963, in *Draugas*, the largest American-Lithuanian daily and one of the largest nationality papers in this country:

It would be very good if the U.S. House of Representatives established a Special Captive Nations Committee without delay. Should this undertaking fail to materialize in the immediate future, the House Rules Committee ought to be requested to give its consent to the establishment of the committee so that the House could vote on the resolution.

"Appropriate resolutions to this effect have been introduced in the House by two Congressmen, DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and EDWARD DERWINSKI, Republican from Illinois, both of whom are energetic fighters for the liberation of captive peoples. This means that the resolution has bipartisan support. The resolution failed to pass the House in the last session. It became stuck in the committee, mostly due to the State Department's lack of endorsement of the whole idea. This session has a much higher potential for the passage of the resolution."

There are dozens of supporting resolutions introduced in this session. But the editors of *Draugas* are correct in another respect—if one can speak of bipartisan support of the resolution, this is a case at its best.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to quote from *Draugas*, on the subject of our State Department's opposition to the Captive Nations Committee. The paper said editorially on April 29, 1963:

We live in a free country. The fact that the State Department does not endorse the resolution 100 percent * * * does not mean we must throw in the sponge and wait until somebody else resolves our freedom problem. We did not receive the right to live free from the State Department * * * and in a democratic country even the State Department must pay attention to public opinion. America's democratic government is from the people and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, the same conference further resolved to work toward the commemoration of the Captive Nations Week this coming July, barely 2 months from this date. I understand that some Senators and Congressmen have already written the White House reminding the President not to forget the date and to issue an appropriate proclamation as provided for in Public Law 86-90. Perhaps more of us should follow this example and write the President without delay.

"*Draugas*," which claims to speak on behalf of 1 million American Lithuanians, also suggested that the resolution establishing House Special Committee on Captive Nations should be passed before the Captive Nations Week. The paper even urged its readers to write the members of the Rules Committee as well as individual Congressmen urging the passage of the resolution. I quote again:

There are quite a few Congressmen, friends of the captive nations, who support the res-

olution and are good friends of the Lithuanians. We must appropriately remind them of the need for action. Let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join in the American Lithuanian appeal: Let us do it. Let us pass House Resolution 14 establishing the Special Committee on Captive Nations before this year's Captive Nations Week. What could be more fitting than a Presidential proclamation and congressional action aiming at the same ultimate noble goal—liberation of captive peoples?

Let us do it, Mr. Speaker.

Vice President Johnson Describes the Positive Policy of the Democratic Party in Milwaukee Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

MR. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 4, 1963, Wisconsin Democrats gathered in Milwaukee for the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner had the great privilege of welcoming Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to our State.

This was a day to remember for the Democratic Party in Wisconsin and for Democrats everywhere. Vice President JOHNSON, in an inspiring speech that gave new strength and spirit to its hearers, set forth the positive policy of the Democratic Party in meeting the great needs of our times.

The faith of the Vice President in the triumph of our free democratic society, which was so eloquently evidenced in his speech in Milwaukee, should reinforce and enhance the faith of Democrats and all Americans in the world struggle against communism.

Vice President JOHNSON's speech follows:

VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON DESCRIBES THE POSITIVE POLICY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN MILWAUKEE SPEECH

A \$100 a plate dinner often consists of a \$2 steak, a two-bit salad—and a 2-hour nap.

Your good Milwaukee food has already upset that formula. And after that introduction by BILL PROXMIRE, I feel like making a wide-awake \$97.75 speech—because this is no time for Democrats anywhere to be asleep.

You did not pay your \$100 to see—and be seen—at a party gathering. You made the contribution—and, in many instances, the sacrifice—because there are values for which you stand, ideals in which you believe, and goals toward which you aspire as free men and women and as responsible Americans.

I know what is in your hearts because I know the Democrats you have sent to Washington.

You have an independent, courageous, vigorous team in the Senate—BILL PROXMIRE and GAYLORD NELSON. I can say on personal authority that they are not afraid to speak out against anything or anybody when they disagree. But it is even more important that they are always ready to speak up any time for the people.

In the House, your Democratic delegation has no peer. Call the roll of Wisconsin Democrats and you call the names of some

of the most valuable Members of the Congress—a leader in the fight for peace, BOB KASTENMEIER; a fighter for the farmer, LESTER JOHNSON; a hero of the battlefield fighting today on the battlefield of human rights and justice, HENRY REUSS; a man taken away tonight for the proudest of family reasons, but a man always present and accounted for when the people need him on the job, CLEM ZABLOCKI.

You have sent great Americans and good Democrats to Washington. I am proud that at Madison this year you have another distinguished Democrat who is getting your Wisconsin's economy moving again—my good friend and your Governor, John Reynolds.

The party may have two wings in Wisconsin. But nearly everything that flies has to have two wings. I would only worry about Wisconsin if I were told the party was trying to fly on only one wing and a prayer. I can be sympathetic with his problems, but I am unreserved in my congratulations on the zeal and effort being offered by the leadership of your State Chairman, Pat Lucey.

As Americans, we are interested vitally in our Government today—because we know that there is a great overriding issue before all humanity—whether the future belongs to freedom or slavery.

We believe the cause of freedom must, can, and shall prevail. We have faith in the basic values of our system, in our country's future, and in the people. We are drawn together as Democrats by our faith—not by our fears.

That is the basic distinction between the two political parties.

Both parties are loyal. Both are patriotic. Both are composed of honorable men and women. Both parties are determined America shall succeed and that communism shall be vanquished.

Loyalty is not the issue—and it has never been.

The issue between the parties is the kind of leadership offered for the people.

Let me say that in the great struggle between the philosophies of freedom and of communism, the issue of the kind of leadership is all important. We must understand that if we just call the roll on the differences between our country and the Soviet Union, the balance sheet in terms of resources and population does not guarantee success.

Here are a few examples:

1. In terms of population, the Soviet Union has a distinct edge—221 million people to our 187 million people.

2. In terms of arable land, the Soviet Union again has a distinct edge—585 million acres compared to our 188 million acres.

3. In energy fuels—oil and coal—Soviet reserves are definitely larger than ours, even though our production is more efficient and we make better use of our resources.

4. In many vital minerals—perhaps the best example is manganese—the Soviet Union has far larger reserves than do we.

5. In overall food supplies, we are far ahead—but this is efficiency of production and not resources, and we could be overtaken.

6. In housing our people, we take the lead—in 1960 we constructed 1½ times as much.

7. Soviet steel production is below ours, but at present rates of growth, we could be overtaken by the end of the decade.

8. In the field of space, the Soviets took an early lead in constructing big booster rockets, and we have not caught up to them yet—and they are also ahead of us in experience gained from manned space flights.

9. In electric power we are far ahead of the Soviets.

10. But in one vital field there is a disturbing trend which could be decisive—the field of education. In 1950 we graduated 52,000 scientists and technicians while the Russians graduated only 36,000. Ten years later, in 1960, we graduated only 38,000 and the Russians graduated 111,000.

When we look at these trends, I think it is apparent to all of us that—we cannot sustain freedom merely by statistical superiority. What counts—what can and must make the difference—is the superiority of freedom as a way of life and the willingness of people to work and to sacrifice for it.

These they will do only if we make our system work.

And it is in this field—making our system work—that we must really choose between the two parties.

One party has a program of action. The other party has only a habit of opposition. One party moves—the other holds back. One party lives with hope—the other lives with doubt. One party says "Yes" to the people—the other says "No."

Today, these distinctions are being clearly drawn—more clearly than in 30 years.

Out from under the comfortable shade of the canopy of plenty which has been raised during these abundant years, there are growing new needs among the people. Answers—affirmative answers—are demanded from the political parties of America.

The Democratic Party knows what it stands for. We believe in affirmative answers. We believe in moving—and facing up to the issues. We also know who we are for—our President, John F. Kennedy.

Let us look at the record of America's problems for every one of which our administration offers a program.

On the issue of Cuba last October our administration united all the people to prove American strength up to the hilt.

The strong young man in the White House stood up to the aggressor and drew the fangs of aggression. No one can rewrite that fact of history.

Today we have one national purpose and policy toward Cuba. That is to get rid of communism and Castro.

We are working every day toward that goal.

We are succeeding.

We are not dropping bombs, we are not attacking ships, we are not plunging the world into nuclear war.

But we have warned the world that we will not tolerate Castro's subversive activities through the use or threat of force. At the March meeting of President Kennedy and Central American Presidents in San Jose, measures were agreed upon to thwart Castro-Communist efforts at indirect subversion anywhere in the hemisphere.

Further because of our efforts—because of the respect and support and unity of our allies—Cuba is a showcase of Communist failure that is costing the Soviet Union more than \$1 million a day to prevent complete and final collapse.

Cuba's gross national product has fallen 25 percent.

Agriculture is failing under communism there as everywhere else.

Food consumption is down 15 percent. The 1963 sugar crop is the smallest since World War II.

A quarter-million Cubans have left Cuba—and we have received 300,000 individual Cuban requests for visa waivers to come to this country.

Free world trade with Cuba last year was one-tenth what it was before Castro—and it will be only a trickle this year. Trade between Cuba and Latin America will virtually disappear in 1963.

The unity of the hemisphere has never been greater.

This is not failure. This is not a record of compromise. This is a record of proud American responsibility.

We are determined that communism in Cuba must go—and shall go.

We will not be satisfied until the Cuban people have been assured the opportunity of freely choosing their own government.

If anyone has more information than the Commander in Chief, more than the Joint Chiefs, more than the Secretary of State or the CIA, more than our patrol missions, we will welcome it and put it to use. And if anyone can offer a positive program that is not now being carried out, we will welcome any suggestions.

And I would like to add that no responsible leader of either party has come forward with such a program yet. We have heard words but no proposals for action.

We can have affirmative answers in the international field only if we have affirmative answers at home. And the Democratic Party is aware of the problems of our times.

When the 20th century began, only 1 out of 25 Americans was over the age of 65. Now, it is 1 out of 10. There are 1,000 more Americans past 65 tonight than there were at this hour last night.

At the other end of the spectrum, 40-percent of our population today is under the age of 21. We have 1 million more 16-year-olds alone this year than last year. Our country is growing—30 million more people during the 1960's, 40 million more to come during the 1970's.

Fifty-six percent of the aged couples live on less than \$2,000 a year. Eighty percent suffer chronic diseases. One in five aged couples have hospital bills each year and half the time the bills exceed \$700—one-third or more of their total income.

There is a need. There must be an answer. The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

For our youth, we must in this decade provide 26 million new jobs—but we are running far behind. Unemployment among young workers is 2½ times higher than the national average—and it will grow worse if we don't act.

Seven and one-half million pupils will drop out of our schools during the 1960's without a high school diploma—and enter the job market as unskilled labor.

Four out of ten fifth-graders today will never finish high school.

There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

Our cities must have efficient and economical mass transit. We must keep our air pure, our water clean, our drugs safe. Our agriculture must be strengthened. Small businessmen must have a chance to succeed. Prosperity and good times must not be allowed to pass by any region or any State.

No group of Americans among us must be forced to sit at the second table because of their race, religion, region, or national origin.

These problems—and all the rest—are not political issues, contrived by parties. These are problems in the lives of our people which the people expect the parties to help them solve.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

When I speak to you of these things America must do, I speak with the strongest of personal feelings. I hate poverty. I hate it because, like many of you, I have known it too well as boy and man. I say it is not enough for our generation of Americans to be the vigilant and uncompromising foes of communism abroad if we are to be indifferent companions and associates of poverty and waste and neglect among our own people at home.

America is not a declining and waning country. It is not second best. It is just the opposite—strong, vigorous, and healthy. While we have that strength and vigor and health, we must meet our people's needs for that will make us stronger.

The negative failure to come to grips with the people's problems is costing us far more than would affirmative answers. Underuse of our manpower costs our economy more than \$30 billion a year. Racial and religious discrimination loses us \$15 billion a year in

productivity. Even the pollution of our air costs \$11 billion annually. These are the costs we cannot afford.

Thirty years ago in the fateful year of 1933, the Republican Party began to tell the American people that they could never afford the cost of their own relief from economic depression. They were proven wrong, wrong beyond all doubt; and yet today we still hear the same song, America cannot do it.

Yesterday's programs will not meet today's needs—and today's Democratic Party is not attempting to reapply those programs. Today's Democratic leadership responsibly recognizes the burdens upon the people of tax rates adopted in other times for other needs, and proposes to reduce these tax burdens for our families and for our private enterprise. But it has become so inherent in the Republican Party to oppose that after decades of opposition to high taxes, Republicans today are even resisting the reduction of taxes because the reduction is proposed by a Democratic President—John F. Kennedy.

This issue of obstruction—this issue of the Republican "No" to the needs of the people—has become the central issue of American political life today, and we must carry that case to the people.

In 1935, only 1 Republican joined 253 Democrats to defeat a motion which would have killed the Social Security Act in the House.

In 1936, only nine Republican Senators voted for creation of the REA to bring electricity to our farm families.

In 1938, only two lone Republican Senators voted to establish the first minimum wage.

Today, the margins of opposition and obstruction have returned to the pattern of 30 years ago. Eighty percent of Republican Senators voted against the urban mass transit bill. Eighty-eight percent voted to cut funds for America's water resources. Eighty-six percent of the Republican Senators voted to defeat and succeeded in killing medical care for the aged. Twenty Republicans voted against—and only seven voted for—the youth opportunity bill.

No man can answer—not Rockefeller, not Romney, not even Barry Goldwater—what the Republican Party is for. A negative party, a party without a program, a party without a leader, a party without an apparent and consistent purpose is not a party which serves the needs of America's people at home today.

America stands as a leader of a hopeful world. America stands as the leader of the hopes and faith of men everywhere who would be free. American strength is helping to keep peace for all mankind.

Only a few months ago in Greece and Turkey, I stood at the line that was drawn against Communist aggression 15 years ago by an American President, a Democratic President, Harry S. Truman. That line has never been crossed. I have seen the effort the people at Vietnam are making to keep their freedom against Communist subversion. I have seen the effort being made by people in Asia and Africa and Latin America to build for themselves the strong base on which freedom can stand and the people can prosper.

I live with faith that the tide runs with us. Fifty new nations have come into being since World War II—more than at any other such time in history. Not one of them has chosen the way of communism. But many of them have written their constitutions after the model of our own and look to us and to our system for guidance and inspiration in their own efforts now to remain free and grow strong and prosperous.

If we are to meet our responsibilities, if we are to fulfill this moment of opportunity for American greatness, we must have in our national leadership members of that party which answers "Yes" to the people's needs—answers "Yes" to the future of free-

dom—answers "Yes" to the hopes of mankind.

Shoe Industry Suffering From Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

MR. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I attended a breakfast with leaders of the shoe industry at which we were familiarized with the current situation of this industry, particularly the disastrous effects upon it due to the large imports of shoes from abroad.

The shoe industry is of vital interest to the economy of New England, which leads the entire Nation in the production of shoes. Figures available for the year 1962 show that the United States as a whole produced a total of 619,407,000 pairs of shoes, and of these 203,395,000 pairs were produced in the New England States. This amounts to 32.8 percent of the total production of shoes in the country.

The shoe industry in the United States employs some 240,000 people, of whom 79,000 are employed in shoe manufacturing in New England. The total annual wages paid to all employees in the New England shoe factories in 1962 is estimated at over \$258 million. This constitutes a very sizable segment of the economy of our region, and if this industry should be hurt the way textiles and others have been hurt, New England may find itself in a very difficult economic situation.

In my own district, the Second Congressional District of Connecticut, there are 7 factories producing nearly 4 million pairs of shoes per year. In one of these, located at North Grosvenordale, Conn., where there are employed from 200 to 235 persons, sales in the past year have fallen off by nearly 20 percent. The same is true at the other shoe factories. This is due primarily to the large imports of shoes from abroad which are competing with our own products.

The volume of shoe imports has grown phenomenally in recent years. In 1955 we imported less than 8 million pairs of shoes, but by 1961 shoe imports had grown to nearly 37 million pairs and in 1962 it had reached more than 55 million pairs. This is an increase of 605 percent within 7 years. At the same time we used to export about 5 million pairs of shoes a year, but last year our exports were less than 3 million pairs.

In all, we have some 1,300 shoe factories in the country located in about 600 communities, most of them being small towns where this industry constitutes their major and often only source of income. This means that every factory affected by the competition from abroad and forced to close down or curtail activities will at the same time affect the local community and its economy.

Of the 55 million pairs of shoes imported last year, nearly 28 million pairs, or about half of the total, came from Japan where the average wage is 36 cents per hour for shoeworkers. Smaller quantities of shoes are imported from Western European countries, which also pay their workers considerably less than we do in this country. This makes the shoe industry not only highly competitive, but also a low-profit industry, ranking among the lowest of all industries recorded in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I can well appreciate the need for expanding our international commerce on which the jobs of several million Americans depend, including many in the New England States. I believe, however, that the shoe industry constitutes a specific problem and deserves fuller attention to enable this industry to maintain its place in the Nation's economy. It has been suggested that a voluntary quota system be established in certain industries suffering from extreme foreign competition, and I can think of no better place to start with such a system than the shoe industry.

At any rate, speedy action is necessary for the survival of this industry because of its importance to the American economy, and also to protect the interests of American consumers who seek quality products. I urge the Congress and the administration to look into the possibility of setting up a voluntary quota arrangement which would restrict imports by category and also by country. This is fair and just.

Why Leave Out the Fighting Soldier?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 5555, which provides increases in pay for members of the Armed Forces, includes provisions for special and incentive pay for hazardous duty for hundreds of thousands of individuals at an annual cost of \$632,486,960. Despite the fact that the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill included extra pay for duty subject to hostile fire, this provision has been dropped from the reported bill.

I am including with these remarks a list of the types of duty which receive extra pay, the amount of the pay is shown, and a comparison of the Department of Defense proposal, H.R. 4696—the bill reported by the Rivers subcommittee, and H.R. 5555—the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee, is included. It is incredible that all of the special and hazardous duty pay categories were retained in H.R. 5555 except the small group of men subjected to hostile fire currently serving in southeast Asia.

An amendment is to be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to correct this inequitable situation and

I believe that Members can readily see the extent of this gross injustice by viewing the comparative chart which appears below:

INCENTIVE PAY FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY¹

| Entitlement | Current (dollars per monthly) | DOD proposal (H.R. 3006) | H.R. 4696 | H.R. 5555 |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| a. Parachute duty: Officer..... | 110 | Retain | Retain | Retain, Do. |
| Enlisted..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| b. Demolition duty: Officer..... | 110 | do | do | Do. |
| Enlisted..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| c. Flight duty (see enclosure): Crew member..... | | do | do | Do. |
| d. Flight duty (noncrew): Officer..... | 110 | do | do | Do. |
| Enlisted..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| e. Thermal stress duty: Officer..... | 110 | do | do | Do. |
| Enlisted..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| f. Low pressure: Officer..... | 110 | Retain and add "high" | Retain and add "high" pressure. | Retain and add "high" pressure. |
| Enlisted..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| g. Submarine duty (see enclosure 1)..... | | Retain | Retain | Retain. |
| h. Leprosy: Officer..... | 110 | do | do | Do. |
| Enlisted..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| i. Glider flight duty: Officer..... | 110 | do | do | Do. |
| Enlisted..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| j. Human acceleration: Officer..... | 110 | do | do | Do. |
| Enlisted..... | 110 | do | do | Do. |

SPECIAL PAY

| | | | | |
|---|---------|---|-----------|------------|
| a. Sea and foreign duty (enlisted only): E-9..... | \$22.50 | Eliminate | \$22.50 | \$22.50. |
| E-8..... | 22.50 | do | \$22.50 | \$22.50. |
| E-7..... | 22.50 | do | \$22.50 | \$22.50. |
| E-6..... | 20.00 | do | \$20. | \$20. |
| E-5..... | 16.00 | do | \$16. | \$16. |
| E-4..... | 13.00 | do | \$13. | \$13. |
| E-3..... | 9.00 | do | \$9. | \$9. |
| E-2..... | 8.00 | do | \$8. | \$8. |
| E-1..... | 8.00 | do | \$8. | \$8. |
| b. Medical and dental (officer): (1) Less than 2 years active duty..... | 100 | Retain | Retain | Retain. |
| (2) 2 to 6 years active duty..... | 150 | do | do | Do. |
| (3) 6 to 10 years active duty..... | 200 | do | do | Do. |
| (4) Over 10 years active duty..... | 250 | do | do | Do. |
| c. Veterinarians (officers)..... | 100 | do | do | do. |
| d. Diving duty: Officer..... | 100 | do | do | Do. |
| Enlisted: Master diver..... | 100 | do | do | Do. |
| 1st class diver..... | 80 | do | do | Do. |
| Salvage diver..... | 65 | do | do | Do. |
| 2d class diver..... | 55 | do | do | Do. |
| e. Proficiency pay (enlisted only): P-1..... | 30 | do | do | Do. |
| P-2..... | 60 | do | do | Do. |
| f. Unusual responsibility: Colonel..... | 150 | Eliminate | Eliminate | Eliminate. |
| Lieutenant colonel..... | 100 | do | do | Do. |
| Major..... | 50 | do | do | Do. |
| Captain..... | 50 | do | do | Do. |
| g. Reenlistment bonus..... | None | \$500 to \$2,400 depend- ent upon criticality of skill and as de- termined by Secre- tary of Defense. | Retain | Retain. |
| h. Career incentive..... | | | Eliminate | Eliminate. |
| i. Duty subject to hostile fire..... | None | \$55 | Retain | Do. |

¹ Currently, a member is entitled, if otherwise qualified, to only one incentive pay for hazardous duty; H.R. 3006 and H.R. 4696 will authorize a maximum of two incentive pays for hazardous duty.

² Not implemented.

³ Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 authorized \$45 per month for service in Korea.

San Francisco Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and to our colleagues attention the fact that the San Francisco Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee met on April 21, 1963,

At that gathering over 1,000 San Franciscans met to observe the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. They met so that we would not forget "a chapter in the annals of human heroism."

From mid-April through the first week in May in 1943 the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto carried on a heroic and hopeless fight against the overwhelming power of the Nazi troops bent upon their extermination. As President Kennedy stated in his proclamation of March 8, 1963:

The result was known by the Jews to be foredoomed. Yet, though they lacked both military resources and military tradition,

they were able to conduct their struggle against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism, an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be best, as a general rule, to not remind ourselves of such inhuman conduct. Such is not the case here, for reflection on the Warsaw uprising demonstrates the valor of the human spirit and more importantly the need to prevent such recurrence of the depravity of which some men have been capable.

Rabbi Saul E. White, chairman, Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee and the organizations comprising the Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee, including the San Francisco Council of Rabbis, the Board of Cantors of Northern California, the Associated Jewish Organizations of San Francisco, the Bay Area Zionist Council, the B'nai B'rith Lodges of San Francisco, the Workmen's Circle, and the Jewish Labor Committee are to be commended for their task. We must never forget this most tragic and brutal historical fact. The generation grown up since 1943 and succeeding generations must know of this brutal extermination and must know of the human spirit and will of these valorous people.

The San Francisco committee has done much to keep alive our knowledge of the great human spirit and great will of those heroic men, women, and children who perished 20 years ago.

Combat Pay Is Right in Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

MR. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, from a marine I received this morning the following brief but eloquent note:

Combat pay should not be taken away from the infantryman. Fliers get extra pay for doing their duty—other servicemen get hazardous duty pay for doing their job. I think sitting in a foxhole and being shot at is just as hazardous, don't you?

In a more formal manner I heard yesterday from the Department of Maryland Veterans of Foreign Wars as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENNETT: On behalf of our department officers, and 14,000 members in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, we wish to inform you that we are very much in support of additional combat pay for the military forces.

It is respectfully requested that when H.R. 5555 is brought up for consideration in the House, that you support an amendment that is expected to be offered to have combat pay restored to this bill.

This is a "key objective" in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and we sincerely hope that you will give assist-

ance to having this amendment restored, as we know it will benefit our comrades-in-arms who are maintaining the peace in this 17th year of the cold war.

Respectfully,

CHARLES A. KREATCHMAN,
Quartermaster/Adjutant.

Hostile fire pay, otherwise called combat pay, was paid to personnel in front line combat units in World War II and in the Korean war as a result of congressional action. Men in the U.S. armed services are dying and being wounded today in combat for our country. When the Department of Defense asked Congress this year to put combat pay in the pay bill now before us it said:

While combat is, of course, the basic purpose of a military establishment, the fact remains that the actual hazards and hardships of combat are currently experienced by a small percentage of the Armed Forces.

In approving \$55 per month to be paid, under strict regulations, the Department said:

It is, of course, impossible for the Government to compensate adequately for this kind of sacrifice or potential sacrifice, but it would give a token recognition of the special role being played by such personnel.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Special Subcommittee on Military Pay of the House Armed Services Committee approved this request.

The total annual extra pay for specified performances in the Military Establishment in addition to usual duty totals \$632,486,960, as shown in the report of the committee on H.R. 5555. The record shows that the cost of combat pay is estimated to be in the neighborhood only of \$1 or \$2 million annually, depending on the tightness of the regulations.

The committee in the Department of Defense which did the basic studies for this proposal made these conclusions:

(a) To provide special pay to individuals assigned to duties in which they are subject to the hazards and discomforts of combat is feasible, desirable, and consistent with the policy in the military service of awarding extra compensation for extra hazardous duties.

(b) Combat duty pay should be both an award for performing a hazardous and disagreeable duty and tangible recognition of performance of a necessary and sometimes heroic service. As such, payment should be rigidly administered and restricted to those individuals normally subjected to the hazards and discomforts of combat. Properly administered, it would improve the morale and effectiveness of the individuals assigned to duties in combat or quasi-combat conditions.

(c) It is impossible to assay the degree of risk one assumes when in a combat situation, or to equate the risk with monetary compensation. However, considering that Congress evaluated and approved \$45 per month 10 years ago, and that other hazardous duties authorize minimum payments of \$55 per month, that \$55 would be a proper amount.

(d) There is no discernible difference in the exposure to hazard and hardship experienced by officers and enlisted men, and therefore the additional pay awarded for combat duty should be equal.

(e) We have in the military service today, have had for most of the time since the Korean war, and will likely continue to have individuals performing duty under combat

conditions suffering all the hazards and discomforts of such duty.

(f) The combat pay bill of 1952, while still on the statutes, is not operative because it applies only to units engaged in the Korean war.

Although this hostile fire pay is not restricted to infantry this is where the chief impact will be felt. And so it should be. When the infantryman is committed to action he knows that he will be there until the issue is decided one way or another or until he is killed, seriously wounded, or breaks mentally from the strain. Casualty data indicates that at the end of the first 100 days in combat—not necessarily consecutive—one-half of his friends with whom he entered combat will be missing in action, in a hospital, or dead. At the end of 200 days in combat, 93 percent of his buddies will be gone. For all practical purposes, 200 days in front line combat as an infantryman amounts to either a death sentence or a future as a mentally or physically handicapped man.

The Little Girl at the Berlin Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, last fall, while serving as chairman of a special study mission to Europe composed of members of my subcommittee, I visited Berlin.

Our study mission conferred on the problems of that divided city with Gen. Albert Watson, the then U.S. Military Commandant of Berlin; with the head of the State Department mission in Berlin, Ambassador E. Allan Lightner, Jr.; and with other United States and city of Berlin officials.

And then we visited the wall. It is impossible to describe the feeling of physical revulsion produced by the sight of the wall. The wall is an ugly, monstrous thing—a cruel barrier which divides brother from brother, parents from their children, and freedom from tyranny.

I have searched for words to describe my reaction to the Berlin wall—and I found them the other day in a very brief article written by my colleague from New York the Honorable OTIS PIKE.

The article, entitled "Pike's Peek at Capitol," can be read in a minute. It tells a simple, yet a heart-rending, story of a little girl who wanted to show off her new Easter dress to her grandmother in the eastern zone of Berlin. It is a story which, once read, will never be forgotten.

Under unanimous consent I place Congressman Pike's story in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of the membership of the House:

PIKE'S PEAK AT CAPITOL

(By Congressman OTIS PIKE)

Sometimes the smallest and apparently least significant episodes can have the great-

est impact on the viewer. I expect that for the rest of my life I will always associate the difference between the free world and the Communist world with a little girl in a red dress.

On Easter Sunday I was in the divided city of Berlin. In the early morning I had the opportunity to attend one of the many outdoor sunrise services which were held all over West Berlin. It was a lovely day; the joyous and bustling crowds on the west side of the ugly little wall were in sharp contrast to the somber and stagnant atmosphere on the east side.

The small congressional delegation of which I was a member had Easter dinner with some of the troops of our Berlin garrison, and we were all once again impressed with the calm dedication of this small detachment of Americans. The greatest impression, however, came later.

In the company of an Army captain I was viewing the wall from an observation post on the roof of a building. A German border policeman brought a lovely 8-year-old girl up the stairway to the roof.

She was all shined up in her holiday best—a bright red dress and immaculate white shoes and socks.

The guard told me she had come to wave to her grandmother who lived in East Berlin. He said, "Watch the window on the third floor of the fourth building on the right side of the street."

The little girl in the red dress took out a spotless white handkerchief and waved it. There was a single answering flash of white from the window. The little girl saw it and laughed. She kept on waving for 5 minutes, although there was no other answering wave. In East Berlin they keep track of who waves.

Freedom is where grandparents love and play with their grandchildren. Communism is where they don't even dare wave to a little 8-year-old girl in her best red Easter dress.

Members of the Armed Forces Subject to Hostile Fire Are Entitled to Combat Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, has announced he expects to offer an amendment to restore the combat pay provision to H.R. 5555. I expect to support this amendment and believe that in the interest of fairness and equity my colleagues will also wish to support it.

H.R. 5555, as it will come before the House, provides for an annual expenditure of \$632,486,960 in extra pay for specified performances in addition to usual duty pay. Individuals performing the following types of service would receive extra pay in addition to usual duty pay:

Parachute duty; demolition duty; flight duty, crew member; flight duty, noncrew; thermal stress duty; low pressure and high pressure duty; submarine duty; leprosy assignment; glider flight duty; human acceleration; diving duty; proficiency pay for P-1 and P-2 enlisted men; and extra pay for medical, dental and veterinary officers.

CIX—495

The military pay bill, as recommended by the Department of Defense, included combat duty pay. This was defined as duty subject to hostile fire. It was estimated that under present circumstances its annual cost would be about \$2 million annually. I have checked with appropriate officials of the Department of Defense and they advise that considerable experience was gained in administering a pay provision of this type in the Korean War and little difficulty is anticipated in administering this feature under current conditions. It seems to me the height of unfairness to propose expenditures of more than one-half billion dollars for various types of extra-hazardous and specified performance pay and leaving out the small group of individuals being subjected to hostile fire.

American fighting men are not mercenaries. I think there is little doubt that those men and units assigned by the Armed Forces, subjecting themselves to hostile fire, will carry out their assignments with dignity and honor regardless of whether we pass this amendment or not. This has been the history and tradition of the American Armed Forces. On the other hand, it must be understood that these men are not naive or uninformed and they can look about them and see their colleagues receiving extra pay in situations far less hazardous and it is only natural that they should wonder about the justice of such a situation.

The administration favored this proposal, it was retained by the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, and I am confident that my colleagues will wish to support the amendment to assure that those members of the armed forces, subject to hostile fire, will be accorded fair and equitable treatment.

Disarmament: Wishful Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very pleased to read in the Evening Star of May 2, 1963, an excellent editorial on the subject of disarmament. It is entitled "Disarmament: The Grand Delusion." When I read this editorial, Mr. President, I had just finished preparing my weekly newsletter which is being made public today. It is also on the subject of disarmament and is entitled "Disarmament: Wishful Thinking." I ask unanimous consent that the Evening Star editorial and my newsletter to be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Evening Star, May 2, 1963]

DISARMAMENT: THE GRAND DELUSION

The Soviet delegate says the Geneva test-ban talks are a waste of time. He is right. These talks are not leading anywhere, and they should not.

The test-ban concept, so far as we can see, has no meaning except as a step toward nuclear disarmament. The proposal was first put forward out of fear that tests would poison the atmosphere. That danger has been pretty well discounted by the experts; it makes more sense for us to worry about how often our children take on radiation by having their teeth X-rayed than about how they will be affected by reasonable levels of atomic testing, especially underground testing. The argument nowadays centers mainly on the notion that if we and the British and Russians renounce further testing, we will somehow inhibit proliferation of nuclear weapons to other nations. The French do not seem very much impressed with this logic—the Chinese, hardly at all. There is no reason why they should be.

No, the serious significance of a test ban must surely be that it would serve as a first step back from commitment to an atomic arms race—a psychological break in the cold war that might lead eventually to disarmament. The serious question about the test ban is whether it makes sense in this context.

We think not. We do not believe disarmament will be a practical possibility in the foreseeable future—certainly not until solutions are found for political issues such as Berlin. It seems to us silly to fiddle around with wishful steps in that direction.

Of course it is dangerous for the world to keep piling up atomic armaments. But if in fact that is what the world is going to do, it is more dangerous to tranquilize ourselves with delusions of safety. This is a dangerous world. It will become more dangerous. And much as we yearn for relaxation—much as we would like to feel we have everything under control—we are not going to enjoy that sensation in our time.

Our situation might be likened to that of a not very bright man in a room which is filling up with explosive gas. He can breathe it safely, but if he ignites it it will blow him to kingdom come. What do we worry about here—what do we want the man to do? Eventually, if possible, he should of course shut off the gas and clear it out of the room. For the present he does not know how to accomplish this. His chance of survival lies in a recognition of his limitations and his danger. He must understand that the room is charged with sudden death; that the slightest mistake on his part will set it off. The worst mistake we could make would be to lead him to believe things might not, after all, be as dangerous as they seem. Would we be doing him a favor if we suggested that by tinkering with the valves he might slow down the inflow? Might we not be encouraging him to test his new-found relative safety by lighting a match?

Like the man in the room, we are endangered most in this age of overkill by failure to apprehend the true extent of our danger. We will not be making things a little safer for ourselves by clutching at the straw of a little disarmament. Fifty superbombs are not necessarily safer than a hundred. If 50 less superbombs makes us feel safer, that in itself makes our situation more dangerous. The biggest thing we have to fear is lack of fear itself.

This is not to say, either, that hydrogen weapons necessarily have made war obsolete. The inventor of dynamite thought he had done that. Peace through mutual terror, in Churchill's phrase, may well be as precarious today as it always has proved.

But we hold this gloomy view of the alternatives: If there is any chance that man will be restrained from war by the horror at his disposal, no good end is served by trying to pretend against our better judgment that the situation can be tamed.

And if on the other hand man is not going to be restrained, then we will, like our cave

man ancestor, want all the weapons we can lay our hands on.

DISARMAMENT: WISHFUL THINKING

The cost of liberty is high, and there is no such thing as a deferred payment plan to live free now and pay later. When a challenge to freedom arises, there is a great temptation to look for an easy way out and to avoid facing up to the challenge and the hard, often risky decisions which an effective defense of liberty requires.

The free world is now confronted with the most serious challenge to liberty in history, for the Communists are relentlessly waging war against freedom. The defense of freedom falls primarily on the United States. The United States together with its allies, has the strength to defeat the war against freedom, but we have failed so far, simply because we have sought an easy way out. Instead of resolving to win the war being waged against freedom, we have sought to "liquidate" it, or make it go away.

Many "easy ways out," separately and in combination, have been tried unsuccessfully—such as containment, foreign aid, cultural exchanges and "the spirit of Camp David," to name a few. In the past few years, a new "easy way out" formula has been expensively prepared, enticingly packaged and boastingly advertised. Early delivery has been promised, so the time has arrived when Americans had better take a long, hard look at the product—disarmament.

Disarmament is not a new product, but the latest model prepared by U.S. policymakers has a new name and several attachments. The new name is arms control. The principal new attachments are mutual deterrence and test ban.

The United States has proposed to the Communists a treaty for "general and total disarmament." This proposal provides for creation by stages of an "international peace force" and the reduction and elimination of all national armaments except those necessary for maintaining internal order. Even the U.S. policymakers correctly recognize, however, that the Communists, with all their devious practices of cheating on agreements, are not likely to agree to a stage reduction proposal while at the starting point the United States has a clearly evidenced superiority in nuclear weaponry. That is where the theory of mutual deterrence or nuclear stalemate comes in.

Mutual deterrence will come into being, according to "arms controllers," when both sides develop a "creditable second strike capability," or in other words, have the ability to strike back effectively even after receiving the first blow. At this point, our policymakers reason, neither side will have to fear the other, and the reduction in arms by stages can then begin. There can be no "mutual deterrence" stability, however, as long as weapons development continues, for one side might possibly achieve a weapons breakthrough and upset the balance. The first step, our policymakers therefore say, must be a nuclear test ban so that new weapons cannot be developed.

Like other "easy ways out," this attractive package will work only in an idealist's mind—never in practice. Consider a few of the defects:

1. The Soviets secretly prepared for a nuclear test series while we refrained from testing during negotiations. Then they surprised us with a series of tests. They would have everything to gain by another secret preparation under cover of a test ban and another surprise testing program.

2. The Soviets are not working toward "mutual deterrence," or a parity with U.S. strike forces. They are straining every resource to obtain a breakthrough in new weaponry that will give them nuclear superiority.

3. The disarmament idea is based on the presumption that both sides want "peace," as we understand the term. The Communists have repeatedly said—and proved—that their goal is world domination, not peace.

4. Armaments do not cause wars. It is the lust of men for power that causes wars; and military weakness, not strength, invites attack.

5. Disarmament proposals are directed at conventional and nuclear weapons. By far worse to contemplate than nuclear attacks are the attacks which can be waged with chemical and bacteriological weapons—small in size, easily concealed and deliverable to targets by human vehicles. What type of inspections will guarantee against use of CBR warfare?

The only sure road to peace is superior military strength. The only hope for freedom lies in total victory over communism. There is no "easy way out."

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Washington Report

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of May 4, 1963:

THE PEOPLE MISLED ON SPENDING IN LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

(Washington Report by Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District, Texas, May 4, 1963)

Example of how the people are misled on Federal spending: The appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, which passed the House this week. The bill as presented called for appropriations of \$5.4 billion. It was claimed this was a reduction of \$309,501,000 from the budget request and \$118,810,000 below the amount appropriated last year. So it would seem Congress is actually saving the taxpayers some \$300 million. The facts tell a far different story. A thoughtful analysis of the book juggling in this appropriation was made by Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, during debate. A few excerpts from his study show how much effort goes into fooling the taxpayers when it comes to spending their money.

Congressman LAIRD pointed out the LABOR-HEW bill contains \$5.4 billion in direct appropriations, but completely overlook the other public funds these Departments are authorized to spend—the so-called trust funds. In addition to the \$5.4 billion authorized in this bill for expenditure during fiscal 1964, these two agencies will spend \$22,132 million from the trust funds account so the actual spending figure we are dealing with is \$28 billion of the people's money. This is the largest appropriation bill the House will consider with the exception of the defense appropriation bill. (Trust funds include such things as the social security trust fund, railroad retirement fund, and the unemployment compensation fund, among others.)

Additional discrepancies in what the House did and what we said we did are pointed out by Congressman LAIRD. The total new obligational requests for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor and related agencies in the President's overall budget is over \$7.7 billion. The reason

the higher expenditures do not show up in the Labor-HEW bill is that some of the programs administered by these Departments come under the jurisdiction of other committees and authorization and appropriation will be called for in later bills to be presented to the Congress. Congressman GENE SNYDER, of Kentucky, reminded the House of one example of what he called "one of the poorest jobs of book juggling we have seen." He pointed out the appropriation bill showed \$217,802,500 for aid to impacted areas school bill as being deleted. The impacted areas school bill has not yet been authorized but it is going to be and the \$217,802,500 will be contained in that bill and you may be sure it will be expanded.

In my own statement during debate I objected to the new programs called for and the increase of 3,700 Federal employees in these two Departments alone. There is absolutely no need for further expansion of Federal programs and personnel beyond last year's highest peacetime budget in history. We are acting as though there were no limit to money. Who is going to pay for these programs? We are in a period of deficit financing. The budget of each Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare should be cut at least 10 percent below last year's budget. There are many activities in these Departments that are not the province of Federal Government. Many such activities must be terminated and the way to start in this direction is to reduce spending.

GOVERNMENT EXPANDS CONTROL IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Kennedy administration seeks to increase its control over our individual lives in another bill which passed the House this week—H.R. 1762, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation. In simple terms this bill sets up a new Bureau for Recreation to coordinate 18 existing Government agencies now dealing with outdoor recreation. The Federal Government does not trust the people to know how to play, so we have over 22,500 Federal employees already on the payroll to direct your leisure activities and the administration is asking for a new Bureau with an initial appropriation of some \$2,460,000.

In speaking against the bill in the House, I said in part: "The Federal Government has no business in such wholesale activities in recreation. It does no good to say that we need a new Bureau of Recreation to coordinate present activities in 18 Federal agencies. Admittedly overlapping and duplication are wrong, but I do not intend to approve such Government participation in recreation as this bill carries. This is a good example of Parkinson's first law that more and more Government and employees are needed to do less and less. The seven reasons for this legislation effectively inject the Government into areas where Government has no place. Such activities are not constitutional. The Government has no constitutional right to encourage and promote recreational activities, individually or collectively. Swimming, skiing, fishing, golfing are all fine recreations. I enjoy them. Some do, some do not. But it isn't a matter of Federal subsidy. It does not follow that money should be taken in taxes to subsidize these and other recreations. The answer is not to coordinate and expand Government recreational activities. The answer is to get the Government gradually out of this field so far as possible. I refuse to approve such use of the taxpayers' money." It is my firm conviction the people know how to provide their own recreation, nor should they be forced to support through their taxes, other peoples' recreational activities.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT

Republicans dedicated to fiscal responsibility scored a major victory in the House

this week in an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act Extension, H.R. 3872. The amendment provides for financing the bank through direct appropriations instead of backdoor financing. In the minority report on the bill Republican members pointed out that the Kennedy administration is responsible for a \$27 billion deficit for the 3 budget years it has been in office. Much of this deficit can be traced to backdoor spending carried to record extremes by President Kennedy. The amendment to H.R. 3872 is designed to stop the loose financial practice of authorizing \$2 billion of backdoor financing of the Export-Import Bank. In its report the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee said in part: "As a matter of policy we believe backdoor financing is wrong. * * * We think it should be brought to an end, not alone for this program but for every other program that comes before our committee and the Congress for either new or additional fund authorizations. For approximately 150 years the Congress operated without engaging in backdoor financing. Furthermore, paragraph 7 of section 9 of article 1 of our Constitution in relevant part states, 'No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.' I heartily agree with the minority view and have never supported the expenditure of the taxpayers' money except where it is authorized by action of Congress. I am opposed to backdoor financing as morally and constitutionally wrong and believe, if the practice is not curtailed, the economy of this Nation will be completely wrecked.

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES THIS WEEK

Among other duties this week: A speech to delegates to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in which I urged the Nation's businessmen to fight for capitalism and the threat to it from the social and welfare programs being initiated by the present administration. Thursday evening, a speech in New York at a dinner honoring former Governor Edison, of New Jersey. I reminded those present, "The America of tomorrow, the free world of tomorrow, the continued existence of the freedom of mankind depends upon the strength and determination of the conservatives. To this generation is given the challenge of keeping America and the world free. We can sum up the challenge in three words: capitalism, sovereignty, the Republic. I believe in all three and I shall do my best to revitalize the enthusiasm of the people for preserving capitalism, the sovereignty of America, and the Republic for which, I hope for all time, we will stand."

Centennial Celebration of Boston College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding institutions of higher learning in our country is Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. From its rooms of education and learning during the decades of its existence have gone graduates engaging in all walks of human activity, who, in peace and war, have played an important part in our Nation's history.

On April 1, 1863, Gov. John A. Andrew of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts signed the University Charter which brought Boston College into being.

This year, 1963, is the centennial celebration of Boston College, a historic event in the life of Boston College, and of institutions of higher learning throughout the country.

The university charter was delivered in 1863 to the Very Reverend Father John McElroy, S.J., founder of the university.

The first president, the Very Reverend Father John Bapst, S.J., presided over a faculty of 6 and an initial enrollment of 22 students in red brick building in the South End of Boston.

For the first 50 years, Boston College grew steadily as a small liberal arts college.

In 1913, Boston College moved to Chestnut Hill, then a rural area.

Still keeping at the core of the university a strong liberal arts college, it gradually filled out the dimensions of its university charter.

In 1925, the graduate School of Arts and Sciences was founded; in 1929, the Law School and Evening College; in 1936, the School of Social Work; in 1938, the College of Business Administration, and since World War II, the School of Nursing, the School of Education, and the Graduate School of Business Administration were inaugurated.

From the original faculty of 6 and the initial enrollment of 22 students, Boston College, on its centennial anniversary, under the leadership of its president and recognized outstanding educator and administrator, Very Rev. Father Michael P. Walsh, S.J.—at the beginning of its second century—comprises 12 colleges with a faculty of 700 and a total enrollment of 10,500 students.

Boston College under the leadership and guidance of its centennial president, Very Rev. Father Michael P. Walsh, S.J., envisions at the beginning of its second century, and in the near future, the construction of a science building, research library, a behavioral sciences building, a university theater and dormitories. It is only within the past few weeks that ground was broken for Carney Faculty Center.

On April 20, 1963, Boston College held its centennial convocation; a distinguished gathering from all walks of life was present.

On this occasion the degree of doctor of law was conferred upon Very Rev. Father Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president of Georgetown University; the degree of doctor of letters upon Lady Barbara Ward Jackson; and the degree of doctor of humane letters upon Dr. Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard University.

This historic occasion was graced by the presence of our beloved and distinguished President of the United States, Hon. John F. Kennedy, and by the great churchman, His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston.

In my remarks, I include the address delivered by President Kennedy.

The address of welcome was delivered by Father Walsh, which I include in my remarks.

Greetings from the church were delivered by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, which I include in my remarks.

From the colleges and universities greetings which I herewith include, were

delivered by Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University, and from the Commonwealth, included in my remarks, greetings were delivered by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, his excellency, Hon. Endicott Peabody.

As its second century starts, Boston College looks forward to the future with faith and confidence, its students and graduates serving God, country, and mankind.

As was well stated by Father Walsh, S.J., the centennial president:

We begin the second century as the first century was begun with a faith that has not failed us, with a hope that has been fulfilled and forever in this university's bright future, with thanksgiving to God.

The addresses follow:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ADDRESS

Father Walsh, your eminence, Governor Peabody, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen; it is a great pleasure to come back to a city where my accent is considered normal, and where they pronounce the words the way they are spelled.

I take especial satisfaction in this day as the recipient of an honorary degree in 1956 from Boston College, and, therefore, an instant alumnus, I am particularly pleased to be with all of you on this most felicitous occasion.

This university, or college, as Father Walsh has described, was founded in the darkest days of the Civil War, when this Nation was engaged in a climactic struggle to determine whether it would be half slave and half free or all free. And now, 100 years later, after the most intense century perhaps in human history, we are faced with the great question of whether this world will be half slave and half free, or whether it will be all one or the other. And on this occasion, as in 1863, the services of Boston College are still greatly needed.

It is good also to participate in this ceremony which has honored three distinguished citizens of the free world—President Pusey, Father Bunn, and our friend from the world of freedom, Lady Jackson.

Boston College is a hundred years old—old by the lifespan of man, but young by that of universities. In this week of observance, you have rightly celebrated the achievements of the past, and equally rightly you have turned in a series of discussions by outstanding scholars to the problems of the present and the future. Learned men have been talking here of the knowledge explosion, and in all that they have said I am sure they have implied the heavy present responsibility of institutions like this one. Yet today I want to say a word on the same theme, to impress upon you as urgently as I can the growing and insistent importance of universities in our national life.

I speak of universities because that is what Boston College has long since become. But most of what I say applies to liberal arts colleges as well. My theme is not limited to any one class of universities, public or private, religious or secular. Our national tradition of variety in higher education shows no sign of weakening, and it remains the task of each of our institutions to shape its own role among its differing sisters. In this hope I am much encouraged by a reading in this last week of the remarkable encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*.

In its penetrating analysis of today's great problems, of social welfare and human rights, of disarmament and international order and peace, that document surely shows that on the basis of one great faith and its traditions there can be developed counsel on public affairs that is of value to all men and women of good will. As a Catholic, I am proud of it;

and as an American, I have learned from it. It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths, and in recent documents of the World Council of Churches, and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing. We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed. It seems reasonable to hope that a similar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of higher learning.

From the office that I hold, in any case, there can be no doubt today of the growing meaning of universities in America. That, of course, is one basic reason for the increasing urgency with which those who care most for the progress of our society are pressing for more adequate programs in higher education and in education generally. It is for this reason that I urge upon everyone here and in this country the pressing need for national attention and a national decision in the national interest upon the national question of education. In at least four ways, the new realities of our day have combined to intensify the focal role of the university in our Nation's life.

First, and perhaps most obvious, the whole world has come to our doorstep and the universities, must be its student. In the strange geometry of modern politics, the distant Congo can be close to us as Canada, and Canada, itself, is worth more attention than we have sometimes given. Cultures not our own press for understanding. Crises we did not create require our participation. Accelerating change is the one universal human prospect.

Second, there is indeed an explosion of knowledge and its outward limits are not yet in sight. In some fields, progress seems very fast; in others, distressingly slow. It is no tribute to modern science to jump lightly to the conclusion that all its secrets of particle physics, or molecular life, or heredity, of outer space, are now within easy reach. The truth is more massive and less magical. It is that wherever we turn, in defense, on space, in medicine, in industry, in agriculture, and most of all in basic science, itself, the requirement is for better work, deeper understanding, higher education. While I have framed this comment in the terms of the natural sciences, I insist, as do all those who live in this field, that at every level of learning there must be an equal concern for history, for letters and the arts, and for man as a social being in the widest meaning of Aristotle's phrase. This also is the work of the university.

And third, as the world presses in and knowledge presses out, the role of the interpreter grows. Men can no longer know everything themselves; the 20th century has no universal man. All men today must learn to know through one another to judge across their own ignorance—to comprehend at second hand. These arts are not easily learned. Those who would practice them must develop intensity of perception, variety of mental activity, and the habit of open concern for truth in all its forms. Where can we expect to find a training ground for this modern maturity, if not in our universities?

Fourth and finally, these new requirements strengthen still further what has always been a fundamental element in the life of American colleges and universities—that they should be dedicated to "the Nation's service." The phrase is Woodrow Wilson's, and no one has discussed its meaning better. What he said in 1896 is more relevant today than ever before, and I close with a quotation from him.

I offer it to you with renewed congratulations, and in the confident hope that as her second century opens, Boston College will

continue to respond, as she did in her beginnings, to the new needs of the age:

"It is not learning," said President Wilson, "but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation. It is indispensable," he said, "if it is to do its right service, that the air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms * * * the air of the world's transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of the race, the sense of the duty of man toward man * * * the promise and the hope that shone in the face of all knowledge. * * * The days of glad expansion are gone, our life grows tense and difficult; our resource for the future lies in careful thought, providence, and a wise economy; and the school must be of the Nation."

Boston College for 100 years has been of the Nation and so it will be for the next hundred.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF VERY REV. FATHER MICHAEL P. WALSH, S.J., PRESIDENT OF BOSTON COLLEGE

One hundred years ago, Americans were girding themselves for what would be, until our time, the most massive single battle in military history, Gettysburg, when, with a magnificent act of faith on our Nation's future, and anxious to contribute what it could to the shaping of that future, Boston College began. Now after a hundred years, we pause to look back in a spirit of humble gratitude to God for the achievements of a century. Joining us in this spirit of joy are leaders of religion, education, and government.

To our faculty, students, alumni, and friends who have come in such impressive numbers to celebrate with us, it is enough to say that our happiness today is theirs.

Since Boston College has never failed to link its destiny with that of our beloved country, it is inspiring to observe that our Government, represented by its leaders in city, State, and Nation, has shown such gracious readiness to be with us today.

Represented here today are colleges and universities of this continent and Europe. To them, our confreres, we extend a most grateful welcome. They have come here with the most congenial and fraternal understanding of what their presence means to us, sensing as few others could, our pride in a century of achievement in higher education.

To Cardinal Cushing, at once our most benevolent father and devoted son, our welcome is what it has always been, one of gratitude and deepest affection.

Mr. President, I speak for all the men and women of Boston College, for all our faculty and friends. We bless you and offer our profound gratitude for your bringing the splendor of the Presidency to ennoble our centennial convocation. The words of our charter are bright again upon the ancient parchment because you came to be with us on our day of jubilee. You came because you understood the meaning of this day not only in the life of this university but in the history of the city whose name it bears. You came, in a word, for Boston.

A university must span many centuries before it can be said to be old; and so, after only one century, it would be more fitting to say that Boston College is still young. That is true of the spirit with which we celebrate today's anniversary. While we pay grateful and most respectful tribute to our past, our energies and our interest are directed to our future. We are impatient to move on with greater and firmer strides into our second century. This distinguished assemblage of friends of our university is witness most of all to a work which is beginning; for no growth is really vital which is not always just beginning. This solemn

duty of the university's perpetual beginning we take up again as it was taken up with such courage and with such undaunted faith 100 years ago.

REMARKS OF RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING AT BOSTON COLLEGE CONVOCATION

Mr. President, Very Rev. Father Walsh, rector of Boston College, members of the faculty, members of the student body, and guests, it is my pleasant duty to express on this occasion the congratulations and gratitude of the church in honor of the centennial of Boston College.

The college has grown with the archdiocese of Boston and it has contributed enormously and indispensably to the growth of the church in this area. It was Boston College that encouraged throughout the years the vocations to the priesthood and the religious life that were necessary for the expansion of the church as the numbers of its faithful began to increase. For over 50 years the students in our diocesan seminary, founded in 1884, came almost entirely from this institution and from its sister College of the Holy Cross in Worcester. Today it is Boston College that provides educational formation and training for hundreds of teachers and administrators in our diocesan schools, so important for the healthy and normal functioning of the church.

There is another reason for our gratitude to Boston College and the Jesuits under whose direction it has grown to its present state of academic efficiency. The church has a part to play within the larger community in which its freedom of functioning is constitutionally guaranteed. It is erroneous to conclude from the concern of Catholics for the expansion of their ecclesiastical structure that their interests are exclusively sectarian, or that they evaluate their achievements in the field of education entirely from the supernatural point of view of revealed religion. Ultimately the church directs the minds of men toward the eternal happiness of the world to come. More immediately, however, the church is concerned with developing the highest ideals of personal integrity and public service. To be genuinely religious means to be conscientious and upright as a citizen, no less than to be loyal and unwavering in the fulfillment of religious duties.

As we find proof in our own day of the relevance of religious beliefs for the strengthening of our Nation against moral decay, we have reason to be thankful that institutions like Boston College are preparing young people for positions of responsibility, and bringing the highest standards of academic excellence into harmonious integration with the ideals of Christian tradition.

For what Boston College has done, is doing and will continue to do for God and for country, for the church and for the state, for the educational world and for the common good, we are thankful today. We pray that He who is infinitely wise and provident, infinitely good and merciful, may enable this institution to fulfill in years to come its divinely ordained purpose of keeping sound minds in sound bodies, of drawing from human powers their greatest measure of scholarly effort and of elevating the human personality to its rightful dignity of sonship with God through Christ our Lord.

GREETINGS FROM THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF DR. NATHAN M. PUSEY, PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The 1860's were a period of intense ferment in higher education in this country. This ferment was occasioned by two kinds of discontent. One, that the attention of our colleges was directed so exclusively toward literary studies, and these not even modern literary studies, that the colleges were making virtually no contribution toward meeting

the practical problems of a rapidly developing society. Scorning the agricultural and mechanical arts they were, it was held by these of their critics using a kind of smear word, "irrelevant." Times have changed.

The other main criticism came from those who had caught a glimpse abroad, chiefly in Germany, of what a university as contrasted with a college could be. There has been a good deal of confusion on this subject ever since. There are many colleges in this country which grandiloquently call themselves universities. There are few universities which, like yours, are content to call themselves colleges. But in any event, in the past 100 years we are in a new period of ferment. Higher education has become extraordinarily almost too relevant. Witness the way President Kennedy has taken and needs a considerable piece of higher education to help him in Washington. Witness the way his Science Advisory Board tells him that certain agencies of Government basically dependent upon the research activities of highly trained engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists will not be able to do their work a decade hence if the rate of producing these kinds of scientists is not quickly stepped up to 7,000 Ph. D.'s a year. Many other interests and concerns seem to me and to others to have equally good claims for this kind of scarce talent. It was only yesterday that the number of Ph. D.'s given annually by all universities in all subjects passed the level of 7,000. It is now about 10,000 per year. The Space Agency itself would like to have about 10,000. Clearly we have a great deal to do.

May I interrupt my remarks just to say about space that today is the day to test the aerodynamic properties of the mortar board. I hope if mine takes off into space I don't go with it.

We have much to do and we are not in the best shape to do it. We have all been struggling to make good the deficiencies which accumulated in our plants during the long, lean years of depression and war and to raise the funds to attract, to hold, and adequately recompense our faculties. Even more difficult have been the pressures for new programs, plants, and equipment originating in the marvelous burgeoning of knowledge. In the midst of this we are confronted with a shortage and therefore a fierce competition for first-rate teachers. And truly frightening is the prospect now breaking over us of soon having such numbers to cope with that we shall have in a decade virtually to double the whole enterprise of higher education in this country which it has taken more than 300 years of patient, devoted effort to bring to its present estate. Mr. President, may I say parenthetically it is our hope that you will be able to help us to get the legislators in the Capitol to see the implication of this remark.

Meanwhile it is a joy to see Boston College forging ahead through its own and its friends' efforts. Deep in the center of the present responsibility of higher education is the need to find ways to adapt to present circumstances the old basic learning with its concern for the development of persons and its own unremitting attention to questions of value. The institutions of higher learning entrusted to the Jesuits have an honorable record in this regard. It is to be hoped among all the other things we have to do that these and other institutions can work together to accomplish this task. May I, as the president of an institution more than 300 years old, say this discouraging word to Father Walsh and his associates, that the common task we share does not get easier with the passing centuries. But may I also for the colleges and universities of the United States felicitate Boston College on the achievements of its first century and of the great development and growth you have experienced in that time.

We welcome the advent of strong Catholic colleges and universities of which surely this is one of the chief, into the advance ranks of our institutions of higher learning. Together these institutions have already done much to build value into our common life and on them our hopes for a worthy future in large measure must surely now depend. The colleges and universities, and among them, I should like to say personally, Harvard, congratulate Boston College on the accomplishments of her first century. We salute her on this happy day for her achievement. We would speak of our pride in our association with her and we wish for her long life and a continuation of that strong forward surge with which she now so clearly and so creatively is moving ahead.

GREETINGS FROM THE HONORABLE ENDICOTT PEABODY, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Your Eminence, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Father Walsh, Father Bunn, Lady Jackson, Dr. Pusey, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Kennedy, Mayor Collins, members of the Board of Regents of Boston College, distinguished guests, and friends of Boston College, in 1847, Father John McElroy, S.J., arrived in Boston and planted the first seeds that have grown and flourished and produced the magnificent bounty we know today as Boston College, one of the great institutions of learning in the free world.

My presence here, today, as Governor of the Commonwealth, is symbolic of the continuing harmonious relationship between town and gown that was begun on that day in April 1863, 100 years ago, when my predecessor, Gov. John Andrews, signed into law the act of the Massachusetts Legislature granting your charter.

Fourteen years later, under the inspired leadership of the Reverend John Bapst, S.J., the first president of the college and corporation, the first commencement was held. Nine young men graduated. And again, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was present to bestow her congratulations in the person of my predecessor, Gov. Alexander H. Rice.

Now, on another day in April, in the year of our Lord, 1963, the Governor of the Commonwealth again comes to Boston College to join in this well-deserved and joyous celebration.

To the many devoted priests and laypeople who labored so humbly and faithfully for so noble a purpose, every citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts owes a debt of gratitude.

For education is one of this Commonwealth's most precious assets. We are indeed proud of the tradition of excellence in education which is so well represented here. All of us who are working for better educational opportunity in Massachusetts can draw inspiration from the story of the birth and growth of Boston College. From humble beginnings in the South End of Boston, you have matured into the magnificent institution of learning which stands before us today.

Sitting among you now, there must be some who were present at the laying of the cornerstone of B.C. at this site on June 15, 1913. One among them was the mayor of the city of Boston, John F. Fitzgerald. Now, 50 years later, on an equally proud occasion in the history of Boston College, how fitting it is that we are honored by the presence of that man's grandson, the President of the United States of America, John F. Kennedy.

Certainly our Commonwealth would be something less than what it is today were it not for the men and women of Boston College. Her contribution has been vast and varied. Doctors, alumni of Boston College, have exercised their merciful calling throughout the Commonwealth. In our

classrooms, sons and daughters of Boston College have been astonishingly active.

The clergy who minister to the Catholic archdiocese of Boston have been predominantly men of Boston College. B.C. has given to the church such eminent men of God as William Cardinal O'Connell and our beloved friend and spiritual leader, Richard Cardinal Cushing.

In the courts of our Commonwealth, countless lawyers, men of Boston College, have pleaded and fought for justice. Just recently I had the pleasure of appointing as a superior court judge one of your law school's most distinguished professors. I am delighted that this appointment has been greeted as one of the finest of this generation.

I cannot resist noting with partisan pride that the first site of Boston College Law School, 11 Beacon Street, today houses my political alma mater, the Massachusetts Democratic State Committee.

The law school forums, the Boston College citizen seminars, the lectures on public affairs have in an extraordinary way blended the dedicated efforts of the good citizens of our community.

Here at Boston College you have achieved an inspiring blend of faith and reason. You have exalted the mind and soul of man. Your proud past is exceeded only by your bright future.

I can think of no more fitting tribute than to quote from a letter sent in 1934 by William Lawrence, the Episcopal bishop of Boston, to your then president, Father Gallagher. Bishop Lawrence explained that the land on which Boston College now stands, was owned by his father. He wrote: "Boston College, with its beautiful group of buildings, has given a grace and benediction to my boyhood haunts."

For me, for all of us, the presence of Boston College is indeed a grace and benediction for which we are most grateful. From your modest beginnings, you truly have earned your name, you have reached "the heights." As Boston College begins its second century of life, let it take with it our best wishes and Godspeed.

Law Day Address by Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a recent speech given on Law Day, May 1, to students and alumni of the Georgetown University Law School by the majority whip of the House, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. In this very fine speech, Congressman BOGGS points up incisively the vast differences between the philosophy of law of our American democratic system, and the philosophy of the Communist system; and I commend his address to my fellow members and include it in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, MAY 1, 1963

It is most fitting that the United States should celebrate a law day on May 1 in order to contrast American fundamental values with those of the Communist system.

The contrast is most vivid in the view of justice held in the two societies.

The American belief is that justice is ultimately based on the people themselves.

The Soviet belief, on the other hand, is that justice can be imposed on a people by the government.

It is this contrasting view of justice and law's relation to justice that I want to explore with you today.

Both the American and the Soviet systems of law aim at creating and maintaining order. Order means more than just a lack of violence, although a lack of violence is essential to both systems. What is central in the concept of order is the element of purpose. Order in a society is an arrangement for obtaining specified purposes or goals or ends. These ends can be the status quo in which case order implies stagnant self-satisfaction. The ends can also involve various degrees of change—from slight or incremental change at one end to violent revolution at the other.

It seems to me that it is this element of purpose which must be isolated in a comparison of the American and Soviet systems of law, order, and justice.

AMERICAN PURPOSE

What, then, is the central purpose in the American legal system? What kind of justice is the United States striving for?

The American view of its law and justice is, of course, based on the whole Western tradition—both its Graeco-Roman and its Judeo-Christian elements.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes put it: "The law is the witness and external deposit of our moral life. Its history is the history of the moral development of the race." I would also add that law is the external deposit of our political life.

Thus, the moral and political history of the Western World is also the history of the American view of law and justice.

The most important product of this long evolution is the conception of justice as based on the people. Lincoln epitomized this view: "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

This view of justice is seen throughout American legal history and practice. Several different elements of American justice reflect this concern with the justice of the people.

One element is the concern for justice in the sense of fair legal procedures. Most of the Founding Fathers were lawyers who had a great concern for such procedures. They had all had some direct experience with what it was like to be deprived of these guarantees. Their reverence for such fair play was, of course, expressed in capsule form in the Bill of Rights.

By these amendments the framers guaranteed that the Government they were creating could be kept within bounds by its citizens. The Government was not free to dispense justice as it saw fit but was limited by the definite standards which were established.

There were to be no unreasonable searches and seizures. A grand jury procedure was guaranteed. The Government could not try a person more than once for the same crime. The Government could not force a man to incriminate himself. Jury trial was guaranteed in all criminal cases and in most civil cases. These trials were to be public and the accused had to understand the charge against him and be aided by an attorney. Witnesses for both sides were to testify publicly. There were to be no cruel and unusual punishments. There would be no *ex post facto* laws.

An equal element in the American view of justice is the attempt to provide justice through legislation. The entire legislative process is based on the popular political will

in the United States, thus assuring a popular base for such laws.

Most importantly, the entire constitutional system of restraints of the exercise of governmental power in the United States is based on the common concern of the American people. The constitutional order in this country exists to provide the arena for the attainment of both legal and political justice. This arena rests on a complex series of restraints of power, restraints which are effective and which are dependable. These restraints are based on a widely shared view of what government should do and what it should not do.

SOVIET PURPOSE

Now, what motion of justice is prevalent in the Soviet Union? What is the central purpose of its legal system?

Just as the American legal system and views of justice are descended from the whole Western tradition the Soviet legal system and view of justice are also descended from history. In this case, however, there are two traditions which must be mentioned: first, the specifically Russian tradition of law and of justice, much of which has been retained by the present Communist regime; and second, the Marxist view of law and justice.

Pre-1917 Russia used Western forms in its legal system but this law did not have truly Western contents—with its stress on rights of individuals, procedural safeguards, and the rule of law. The motion of stare decisis and the tremendous weight attached to precedent in the West were missing in czarist Russia, just as they are missing in the Soviet Union. The Western conception that law is a specialized extension of reason and that a rule of law must be a rule of reason was missing in Russia then as now.

Another pillar of Western law missing in Russia is our well known concept of equity.

What was unique about Russian czarist law from the Western viewpoint is that it allowed an alleged conception of justice to be developed by the rulers of the country and then imposed on the people of that country.

The Marxist view and practice of law has an interesting and varied history. But I think that its impact today in the Soviet Union is to reinforce the peculiarly non-Western elements of the Russian legal tradition.

Marx and Engels themselves viewed law as a superstructure, an unconscious reflection of economic relations in a society. Classical Marxism contented itself with exposing what it thought to be the ultimate sources of law: Law was another name for politics and justice was a euphemism for the predominance of the strongest class and its interests.

Until 1935 or 1936 in the Soviet Union there was a general attack on all law as a bourgeois product. Any kind of traditional law was under particularly strong attack in the early Stalin years, from 1928 to about 1936.

But, beginning roughly with the Constitution of 1936, the stress in the Soviet Union began to change. The new elements which were sought were stability, orthodoxy, and legality as means of consolidating the strength of the Stalinist regime. Law returned and was declared to be in accord with Communist purposes. Since that time law in the Soviet Union has developed particularly as another teaching device controlled by the regime. In short, law and legality are stressed specifically as entities to be used by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its rule of its subjects in their own supposed best interests. Justice does not emerge from the people but is imposed upon them.

Thus when Soviet law is shown to be primarily another tool in the hands of the regime, and when Soviet justice is understood as being essentially what the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proclaim to be just, then the nature of the Soviet totalitarian state is clear. If the law is

the shaper of persons and is not shaped by them, a totalitarian result is inevitable.

CONFRONTATION

These conflicting views of law held in the United States and the Soviet Union have a real impact on the world order and on the prospects for world peace. The understanding of law and the purpose of law in the two countries is radically different.

Because of this, one of the major difficulties in dealing with the Soviets is the lack of communication between the two sides. I am suggesting that one crucial element preventing better communication is the difference in views of law. This lack of communication is one root of the struggle which daily threatens world peace and it is at the same time a complicating factor in any attempt to improve relations between the two nations.

Treaties are also a form of law. Americans believe that treaties made in the name of the United States must ultimately reflect the values of the U.S. citizenry and therefore must be respected and kept.

The negotiators of the Soviet Union, on the contrary, see no particular relation between what goes into a treaty and law which must be obeyed. Treaties, like all Soviet laws, are to be manipulated by the rulers of the party and state for the ends decreed by the party and state. This helps explain why the Soviet Union's record of keeping its word as given in treaties is so dismal.

SUMMARY

In summary, the worth of a given philosophy of law is best measured by the kind of society that it produces.

Throughout the centuries men everywhere have yearned for what Franklin D. Roosevelt called the four freedoms:

Freedom of speech and expression.

Freedom of worship.

Freedom from fear.

Freedom from want.

We will all agree that our American society had come near to the ideal in providing freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, and freedom from fear. We have not reached perfection, for here and there we still have blotches upon these freedoms, but the common conscience of our land impels us constantly to strive to eliminate entirely such infringements on these freedoms as still remain.

We can also agree that in the Soviet society, these three freedoms are almost nonexistent.

Now let's look at freedom from want. The U.S.S.R. and the United States have populations roughly comparable. They have natural resources of like magnitude. Both nations have made enormous industrial strides in this century. Both countries maintain comparable military forces.

There the comparability stops.

Under our concept of law—our framework of a free society—we have produced the highest standard of living for our people that the world has ever seen. No people before us ever had such a bounty of food and fiber, industrial products, and labor-saving devices. To be sure, we still have too much poverty, too much unemployment, too many poorly educated people, but the average American enjoys freedom from want plus many luxuries.

Now what of the society which has resulted from the Soviet concept of law?

We cannot deny that Russia has made material progress in this century, but her society is beset with illnesses which become more aggravated with the passage of time. In a crash program such as building missiles, the Soviets do very well, but in the day-to-day effort to provide freedom from want, her society is lagging.

A recent report of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe reveals that both production and investment are

slowing down everywhere in the Soviet world. Labor discipline is weakening. Inferior goods are piling up. Unhappy farmworkers are crowding into cities. Industry is beset with shortages of raw materials and manpower.

Agricultural production has lagged badly for decades in spite of the most forceful efforts on the part of the Soviet leaders.

In industry, the Soviet system simply fails to provide the incentive necessary for good workmanship. Those of us who have traveled behind the Iron Curtain are uniformly impressed by the shoddy workmanship which we witnessed on every hand. In 1961, for example, 60 percent of all television sets manufactured failed to operate for the guarantee period of 6 months—this is an official government report.

Some tractor operators made the statement that they "spend more time under the tractor repairing it than behind the steering wheel." This lack of quality—this tendency toward careless workmanship—which is so widespread in the Soviet society is not the result of incompetent workers; it is the result of a social system—a philosophy of law, if you please—which does not give the individual the incentive to do his best. As a result, the Soviet world is far from its goal of freedom from want.

To sum it up, we in America have approached the four freedoms because of the philosophy of law upon which our society is grounded. Conversely, the Soviets have not because their philosophy of law cannot—and does not—call forth the best efforts of their citizens.

What I have been trying to say was better said by that eminent lawyer and jurist, the late Learned Hand: "Two conditions are essential to the realization of justice according to law. The law must have an authority supreme over the will of the individual, and such an authority can arise only from a background of social acquiescence, which gives it the voice of indefinitely greater numbers than those of its expositors."

On this Law Day we should be thankful that we have what Jefferson called "A government of laws addressed to the reason of the people and not to their weaknesses." A Law Day celebrating law of any other kind would be an unhappy event. A Law Day celebrating what we do have is a valuable reminder of the ultimate strength of the American system.

One Hundred Thousand People Hear Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson's Tribute to the Polish Constitution, Delivered in Chicago May 5, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 5, the people of Chicago had the great privilege of hearing Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON join in a tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Vice President JOHNSON was the principal speaker in an impressive ceremony sponsored by the Polish National Alliance in Humboldt Park to mark the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

An estimated crowd of 100,000 people heard Vice President JOHNSON introduced by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of

the Polish National Alliance, as the "greatest Vice President the United States has ever had."

The huge throng repeatedly interrupted Vice President JOHNSON's remarks with enthusiastic applause. The Vice President's firm reaffirmation of President Kennedy's principle that "while Poland may be a satellite government, the Poles are not a satellite people," brought a thundering ovation.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's speech follows:

THE BATTLE FOR FREEDOM

(Remarks by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, before the Polish National Alliance, Polish Constitution Day observance, Chicago, Ill., May 5, 1963)

On the 3d of May, in the year 1791, the patriots of Poland adopted the Constitution of Poland which we meet to honor and commemorate today.

In the preamble of that Constitution, there were these heroic and historic words: "Free from the disgraceful shackles of foreign influence; prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence and internal liberty of the nation whose care is entrusted to us * * * we do solemnly establish the present Constitution."

No one who has read that Constitution, no one who knows the history of Poland, no one privileged to know the Polish people wherever they may live would doubt for one moment that if the "shackles of foreign influence" were removed today, that same flame of liberty would burn more brightly than ever in a free and independent Poland.

As President Kennedy has said, "Poland may be a satellite government, but the Poles are not a satellite people."

Barriers separate us temporarily from one another now. Those barriers must some day come down. But barriers cannot separate the American and Polish peoples from their common heritage as friends in freedom's cause. That common heritage is nowhere better expressed than in the common nature, common objectives, and even the common language of our two Constitutions. The Polish Constitution of 1791 brought to the continent of Europe an expression of those principles of justice and self-rule which the American Constitution of 1789 had brought to the continent of North America. Both were revolutionary documents.

Both eliminated distinctions of class. Both guaranteed freedom of speech and conscience.

As it is fundamental to our American system that all power derives from the people themselves, so the Polish Constitution of 1791 declares: "All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

SIDE BY SIDE

It was because Americans and Poles thought alike that when Americans fought for their independence, heroes from Poland fought at their side. In 1772 a 29-year-old Polish officer decided to come to America during our Revolution because, as Pulaski himself said, "Wherever on the globe men are fighting for liberty, it is as if it were our own affair."

Along with Pulaski came the hero of two continents, Thaddeus Kosciuszko. This immortal hero was hailed by Thomas Jefferson as "the purest son of liberty I have ever known."

Kosciuszko—as Chief of Engineers—fortified some of the most vital points of American defense, led America cavalry through the Carolinas, and played a major role of

command in driving the Red Coats from Charleston. Pulaski stood with Washington through the winter of Valley Forge and gave his life for the freedom of America on the ramparts at Savannah.

Today, throughout America, there are monuments and memorials to these great Polish heroes. Statues of both stand in our Nation's Capital. Streets and squares and counties are named for them all across the United States. Ten States have cities named in honor of Pulaski. At West Point—as well as here in this park—there is a statue of Kosciuszko.

By such monuments, America honors not these two men alone. America honors all those brave young men—bearing proud Polish names—who have given their lives in battle under the flag of the United States so that freedom shall not perish from this earth.

But to honor them and to honor our heritage requires more than statues of stone. As the words of the national anthem of Poland expressed it more than a century ago:

"Long as Poles remain,
Chains the foe bound on her, never
Shall the foe retain."

A DETERMINED PEOPLE

The objective of the United States is—and shall continue to be—to see freedom returned to Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe.

We know the years of darkness have not extinguished the light of freedom in Poland. And the masters of the darkness know that, too.

Today, the world watches with keen interest the divisions appearing within the Communist bloc between the Communist rulers of Russia and the Communist rulers of China. This is important. The significance is very great. But we must not—and we shall not—forget that 7 years ago the unvanquished spirit of the Polish people forced Moscow to grant to Poland a new measure of national autonomy.

Poland is a much smaller country than China. There is no comparison in size of population or potential strength. Yet the Polish people—by the sheer strength of their unconquered will—succeeded in forcing the first major change of historical Soviet policy toward the captive nations.

The United States did not ignore the significance of that development. We supported and encouraged the greater autonomy for Poland by increasing our agricultural aid, expanding trade, and instituting programs of exchange in every major field of human endeavor.

Since 1956 well over 1,000 Poles have come to the United States under scientific and cultural exchange programs. More than 400 Polish students are enrolled in our universities now. We have welcomed many Polish groups—from jazz musicians to the Warsaw Philharmonic and the Poznan Choir, from athletic trainees to outstanding scholars.

In turn, many Americans have gone to Poland—some to lecture on cancer research, some to present artificial heart-lung machines to the Polish people, others to teach and train. It is very significant that the single most successful mission last year was the visit of an American professor helping set up courses for teaching English—a language the Polish people are most anxious to learn.

For the most part, these programs are not Government programs, but are being sponsored privately by our own citizens, foundations, and universities. Americans of Polish ancestry voluntarily send more than \$10 million of food to relatives and friends in Poland each year. I believe you will agree it would be good if more Americans were going to Poland under these exchange programs. I believe you would also agree it would be good if Poles in Poland could receive as much

literature in their language from the United States, including the Polish language newspapers published in American, as Polish families in this country are receiving unsolicited from Poland.

These efforts—private and public—are valuable because these exchanges serve to keep the Iron Curtain parted and open to let inside the truth about America and the West.

CHANNELS KEPT OPEN

We believe the channels between our peoples must be kept open.

We believe that people punished enough by their Communist captors should not be—and must not be—punished still more by freemen merely because they are involuntary victims of communism's tyranny.

Fight communism, yes—and fight all its works. But in this land of the brave and free, it is not bravery to strike back at those already struck down by communism by engaging in hit-and-run raids among the shelves of supermarkets against the goods produced by the Polish people.

Our policy has been expressed by President Kennedy in these words:

"Our task is to encourage and pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny."

We are not pressuring tyranny either by boycotting Polish-made goods or by imposing discriminatory tariffs—tariffs which only discriminate against the people of Poland and increase the pressure upon them to follow the puppet leaders, who would have them turn eastward rather than westward for the future.

Your administration opposed enactment of the discriminatory tariff amendment in the Congress, and your administration today advocates repeal of that amendment.

Out of our nearly \$40 billion of imports annually from all countries, the total imports from Poland have amounted to only three-tenths of 1 percent. Those canned hams, fox furs, feathers, and Christmas-tree ornaments are not going to taint the freedom of America. But by maintaining the channels of trade to the West we can keep communism from completing its contamination of Poland and the lives of the Polish people.

The ties between our people are old and honorable. We must work to strengthen those ties—not to sever them. Isolation and reprisal should not be the reward for those whose courage and resistance and independence were the first to force the Communist slave masters to relax their hold.

In 1772—4 years before our own colonies declared their independence—Poland was divided among Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Almost immediately, efforts began to unite all Polish people to stand against Poland's foes. Demands for great sacrifice were made—sacrifice of titles, positions, vested interests, ancient traditions. For nearly 20 years, that effort went on. The determination to win freedom never died.

In 1791—two full decades after the first partition of Poland—the Constitution of Poland was brought forth. A major revolution was accomplished peacefully—without bloodshed or disorder. The people of Poland brought into being a constitutional government closely paralleling that which had been established and was in operation on these shores. In the next year, Poland was invaded once more, by Russia. Kosciuszko returned home from the United States to organize the uprising against the enemy invaders. History tells that the most brutal means were used to crush the resistance of the Polish people and to accomplish the final tragic partitioning of Poland.

But where great and brave leaders had fallen, others rose up, and the determined fight for Polish independence went on. Poland won its freedom again, until the armies of Russia and Prussia invaded two decades ago.

We of the United States can never afford to forget this. Poland has known invaders and conquerors before. But the Polish people have never accepted any foreign yoke. The people of Poland could give lessons to some of their misguided critics about what it means to resist and stand up to tyranny.

We must keep the channels open.

We must preserve in our policy—and in our national attitude—a vital flexibility of maneuver and the inherent honor of an old ally so that the people of Poland may always know that we of the United States are with them and working always for the day when they can be free and independent once more.

H.R. 2332 Urged on Erroneous Pretext That It Helps Low Income Veterans and Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Legislature of the State of New Mexico adopted Senate Joint Memorial 11 urging the Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 2332, a pension bill advocated by one of the veterans' organizations.

The joint memorial apparently was based on the erroneous concept that H.R. 2332 is designed to benefit low income veterans and widows. This is not true. There follows a copy of a letter which I have written to the President of the Senate of the New Mexico Legislature regarding Senate Joint Memorial 11:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1963.

Hon. MACE EASLEY,
President, Senate,
State of New Mexico,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.

DEAR MR. EASLEY: This acknowledges receipt of Senate Joint Memorial 11, "a joint memorial to the Congress of the United States on behalf of the veterans of World War I."

This memorial referred to H.R. 2332, pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and urged consideration of the measure as follows:

"Whereas the Veterans of World War I in New Mexico consider that passage of H.R. 2332 by the Congress will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332."

It is noted that passage of H.R. 2332 is urged on the pretext that "it will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows." This is incorrect. H.R. 2332 is a bill designed primarily to pay substantially increased non-service-connected benefits to World War I veterans and widows in the higher income brackets and provides relatively little benefit to low income veterans and widows.

Veterans' Administration has estimated that the additional first year cost of H.R. 2332 would be \$1,266,247,000. The cumulative 5-year additional cost is \$6,048,136,000, with a total cumulative additional cost to

the year 2000 of \$19,574,821,000. It should be emphasized that these costs are in addition to the \$1.8 billion being spent on non-service-connected pensions this year, a figure which will rise in the future.

There are now approximately 1,862,965 World War I veterans and widows receiving a non-service-connected pension. These individuals qualify for a pension because they have met certain requirements in regard to disability, unemployability, and have met the established income limits of the law. These limits are \$3,000 for the veteran with dependents and \$1,800 for the single veteran or widow. Enactment of H.R. 2332 does very little for this low income group most in need of help. This becomes apparent through an examination of the cost estimates of the bill. Of the \$1,266,247,000 proposed to be spent for increased pensions the first year of enactment, only \$453,818,000 would go to increase pensions for the 1,862,965 low income veterans and widows now on the rolls. Eight hundred and twelve million, four hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars would go to add 713,100 new cases from the upper income groups to the rolls. In other words, 27 percent of the veterans and widows from the upper income groups would receive 67 percent of the benefits.

The inequitable treatment, which would result from the enactment of H.R. 2332, can be demonstrated by examining specific cases. Under existing law, a veteran with two dependents now receives \$95 per month if he is in the lowest income bracket—0 to \$1,000. If H.R. 2332 were enacted, he would receive an increase of only \$5 per month. On the other hand, a veteran with substantial income well above the national average for his age group, who cannot now qualify for a non-service-connected pension, would receive a tax free pension of \$100 per month in addition to this other income.

Under H.R. 2332, individuals could have a combined income of up to at least \$6,000 per year, including a tax free pension of \$100 per month. Yet according to data from the Bureau of the Census, the medium income for all families headed by a 65-year-old individual is only \$2,897 per year. Half the male population of this country has an income of only \$4,081 or less per year. This serves to show that the income limits set by H.R. 2332 are totally unrealistic and are calculated to add veterans and widows fortunate enough to be in the upper income brackets, thus resulting in substantial expenditures for that group and very little for the very low income group who are now receiving a pension in ranges varying from \$85 to \$100 per month, depending on dependency status. The gross inequity of H.R. 2332 is further demonstrated by the fact that it would require the payment of pension to certain veterans from the upper income groups based on 90 days service and unrealistic income limits, and require 23 million taxpayers to contribute to a tax-free pension for veterans with incomes higher than their own.

H.R. 2332 would eliminate the present requirement of law that the spouse's income be considered in computing the veteran's income level. This would open the way to return to the practice of veterans shifting income producing assets to their wife in order to qualify for a pension when little need actually existed. H.R. 2332 would not require the counting of the estate of the veteran or widow in determining eligibility for a pension as is now required by law. This would result in the payment of pensions, presumably based on need, to thousands of veterans and widows who have substantial holdings in the form of real estate and other income-producing assets and who are well able to care for themselves.

It should be noted that practically all of the representations made through individual

letters and made by spokesmen for the groups advocating passage of this legislation are similar to the representation being advanced by Senate Joint Memorial 11. These are based on the erroneous contention that H.R. 2332 is intended to help the needy low income veteran and widow when, in fact, this is not true.

The Congress of the United States has shown great sympathy and consideration for the needs of low-income veterans and widows as demonstrated by the present program, which allows payments of a pension to elderly veterans or widows whose income falls in the bottom 50 percent of the income pattern for the elderly age group. On the other hand, the Congress has not been disposed to providing tax-free pensions to veterans and widows in the upper income brackets, thus guaranteeing those individuals annual incomes far in excess of the national average for their age group, while at the same time paying the 100-percent disabled veteran only \$250 per month. Action of the type advocated by Senate Joint Memorial 11 would result in hundreds of thousands of non-service-connected pensioners, with short periods of service and substantial resources of their own, being accorded better treatment than most seriously disabled veterans who received service-connected disabilities during a war.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

**Chicago-Kent College of Law Observes
Its 75th Anniversary**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 the Chicago-Kent College of Law will celebrate its 75th anniversary with a dinner in Chicago honoring its present dean, William F. Zacharias. Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg will be the speaker.

All of the people in Chicago, as well as scholars throughout our Nation, join in wishing this institution continued success. I am sure that in its 75 years of existence, it has helped develop legal talent which has made a lasting impression upon every single one of our Nation's endeavors. Today, Chicago-Kent College of Law stands out as one of the great legal institutions of our Nation.

It was my good fortune to start my legal training at the Chicago-Kent College of Law. I can personally testify to the high standards this fine institution has developed—standards which have brought it nationwide and international recognition.

I am sure my colleagues will join me in wishing the best of success to those responsible for arranging this 75th anniversary observance and the tribute being paid to Dean Zacharias.

Second oldest college of law in Illinois, Chicago-Kent has trained lawyers who have become judges in every Illinois court and most Federal courts.

The dinner, arranged by the Chicago-Kent Alumni Association, will see a convocation of some of the most distin-

guished legal talents in the country as well as a representation of industrial, civic, and cultural leadership. Louis L. Spear, Chicago-Kent 1938, vice president of the Newspaper Division of Field Enterprises, and Roy H. Olson, senior partner of Olson, Trexler, Wolters & Bushnell, will serve as cochairmen.

Chicago-Kent has always been known as a school for ambitious young men and women who had to support themselves while preparing legal careers. It was founded, in fact, at the behest of law clerks who "read law" in a lawyer's office and did not consider this method sufficiently professional to assure them of the background they would need.

The young clerks met in the chambers of Illinois Supreme Court Justice Joseph M. Bailey and Appellate Court Justice Thomas A. Moran to ask formal instruction, and after a brief period of "classes" in the judges' chambers the college was established in 1888. Judge Bailey became the first dean.

A nonsectarian, co-ed professional school in the heart of the city, it has served the commuting student, the employed student, the talented student of limited means. Over the years the college has helped launch many such students into great careers. It also continues to help the employed student reach his goal.

Chicago-Kent College of Law alumni include such noted figures as Judge Elmer Schnackenberg, Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit; Judge Henry L. Burman, Illinois Appellate Court; Judge Abraham L. Marovitz, Superior Court of Cook; Judge Walter J. Kowalski, Municipal Court of Chicago; William J. Scott, Illinois State Treasurer; Helen W. Munsert, Examiner, Illinois Commerce Commission; E. Douglas Schwantes, former president of Chicago Bar Association; Paul W. Goodrich, president of Chicago Title and Trust; and many others. The late Judge Julius H. Miner, U.S. District Court, was also a graduate.

The goal of the college, according to Dean Zacharias, is to provide sound training in legal principles at lowest possible cost.

Over 92 percent of the students entering Chicago-Kent have already achieved their undergraduate degree at an undergraduate school in Illinois or out of State. Completing their education they either must attend the college for 4 years in the evening, or for 3 years in day session to earn a law degree. Day students, who comprise 40 percent of the student body, are permitted to accept only limited employment.

Situated in the heart of the city near all court facilities, the college enjoys the cooperation of the Chicago courts in its teaching program. Senior students try hypothetical cases before circuit court judges.

Most Chicago-Kent alumni practice in Illinois. They enter the college, however, from undergraduate institutions throughout the Nation and an appreciable number of Chicago-Kent graduates practice in other States. Chicago-Kent has alumni branches in most States.

Chicago-Kent College of Law has been fortunate indeed to have such an

outstanding educator as Dean Zacharias head the college.

Dean Zacharias has been associated with the college since he entered it as a student in 1931 to complete his legal education.

Coming from the University of Chicago Law School, where he had earned the degree of Ph. B. he turned to Kent where the flexible program permitted him to conduct his business while he studied law. He earned the degree of LL.B. in 1933 and was admitted to practice in the State of Illinois that same year. Private practice, largely in real estate and real estate mortgage field, followed, along with graduate work at Chicago-Kent under a scholarship.

In 1934 he was awarded the LL.M. degree by Chicago-Kent. He received his J.S.D. in 1949.

Appointed to the faculty by the late Dean Webster H. Burke, while a graduate student, Dean Zacharias found that his growing interest in teaching and writing began to shape his career.

He has held the following posts at Chicago-Kent: 1934, assistant professor of law; 1935, professor of law; 1942-55, chairman of the editorial board of the Chicago-Kent Law Review; 1948-56, secretary of the faculty; 1951-56, assistant dean; 1956-59, acting dean.

In 1959, a quarter century of distinguished teaching and research was climaxed by action of the Chicago-Kent College of Law board of trustees which named Mr. Zacharias dean of the college.

During the years since he has been dean, Chicago-Kent College of Law has carried out a major rebuilding program.

The enrollment of the college has nearly doubled within the past 2 years.

William F. Zacharias was born in London, England, in 1905, fifth in a family of seven sons. When, at the age of 14, he set out to find his first job in London, he found a clerkship with the London solicitors firm of Pyke, Franklin & Gould, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

In 1920 Mr. Zacharias and his family moved to Chicago. His first employer in the new country, Mr. Henry Utpatel, a 1900 Chicago-Kent graduate, was master in chancery for the circuit court of Cook County and tried to interest him in a career in law.

Working full time for Mr. Utpatel, Mr. Zacharias attended the evening sessions of Central YMCA High School and compressed 4 years of work into 1½ years. He helped found that school's first newspaper and served as its editor.

He was the first graduate of the Central YMCA High School to win a competitive scholarship to the University of Chicago. Working in an insurance and real estate business and studying over the next 3 years he achieved A grades in all of his 27 courses. At the end of his junior year he was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa and became president of his local chapter.

His education in law was formally launched the following year when he entered the University of Chicago Law School where he earned his Ph. B. in 1931.

The author of numerous articles on important legal subjects, Dean Zacharias

is a member of the American Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. He is also affiliated with the American Law Institute, the American Judicature Society, the American Legal History Association, the American Foreign Law Association, and the American Association of University Professors.

He has served many professional societies in special capacity. For example, he has been a member of the Committee of 1,000 of the American Bar Association working to increase its membership; a member of the council of the section of legal education of the Illinois State Bar Association; a member of the executive committee of that organization's affiliate, the Institute on Continuing Legal Education; second chairman of the committee on development of law of the Chicago Bar Association.

Dean Zacharias is a member of Sigma Chi and a trustee of Chicago Barrister Inn of Phi Delta Phi, his own legal fraternity.

Dean Zacharias and his wife, Lenore, have one daughter, Diane, who is Mrs. James Manzelmann and the mother of their seven grandchildren.

Among the distinguished alumni of the Chicago-Kent College of Law are:

Catherine D. Agar, partner, McDermott, Will & Emery.

Bertha Bauer, former Republican national committeewoman of Illinois.

Judge Henry L. Burman, Illinois Appellate Court.

The Reverend Archbald Carey.

Cyrus J. Colter, member of Illinois Commerce Commission.

Judge Thomas J. Courtney, circuit court of Cook.

Peter Fitzpatrick, vice president, Illinois State Bar Association.

Clair W. Furlong, vice president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.

Paul W. Goodrich, president, Chicago Title & Trust.

Clarence K. Graves, president of Lutheran Bar Association.

Sue Brown Hasselle, founder, Kappa Beta Pi, International Legal Sorority.

Judge Harry G. Hershenson, superior court of Cook.

Carlton Hill, senior partner, Hill, Sherman, Meroni, Gross & Simpson.

Axel A. Hofgren, past president of Patent Law Association of Chicago.

Judge Elmer N. Holmgren, superior court of Cook.

Reginald J. Holzer, president of Decalogue Society of Lawyers.

David O. Jacker, past president, Covenant Club.

Weymouth Kirkland, senior partner, Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters.

Marshall Korshak, trustee of Sanitary District of Metropolitan Chicago, and former Illinois State senator.

Judge Walter J. Kowalski, municipal court of Chicago.

John E. MacLeish, senior partner, MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood.

Judge Abraham L. Marovitz, superior court of Cook.

George W. McGurn, Illinois State Toll Highway Commission executive secretary.

Judge Donald S. McKinlay, superior court of Cook.

Foorman L. Mueller, past president, American Patent Law Association.

Helen W. Munsert, examiner, Illinois Commerce Commission.

Sidney Neuman, past president of the Seventh Circuit Bar Association.

Richard B. Ogilvie, sheriff of Cook County.

James L. O'Keefe, public administrator of Cook County.

Arthur A. Olson, senior partner, Olson, Mecklenburger, Von Holst, Pendleton & Neuman.

Roy H. Olson, senior partner, Olson, Trexler, Wolters & Bushnell.

Abe R. Peterson, senior partner, Peterson, Lowry, Rall, Barber & Ross.

Theodore G. Remer, attorney with Union Carbide Corp.

Judge Daniel A. Roberts, Circuit Court of Cook County.

Judge Daniel J. Ryan, Municipal Court of Chicago.

Judge Elmer Schnackenberg, Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit.

E. Douglas Schwantes, former president of Chicago Bar Association.

William J. Scott, Illinois State treasurer.

Louis Spear, vice president, Newspaper Division, Field Enterprises.

Lawrence J. West, senior partner, West & Egan.

Austin L. Wyman, Illinois State Toll Highway Commissioner.

William F. Zacharias, dean of Chicago-Kent College of Law.

Lowell Thomas, former Chicago-Kent instructor, internationally recognized broadcaster and world lecturer.

The late Judge Julius H. Miner, U.S. District Court.

The late Holman D. Pettibone, chairman of the board, Chicago Title & Trust Co.

Governor Henry Horner was a member of the Chicago-Kent College of Law faculty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 7, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 40: 1: Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.

O Thou Father of all mercies and God of all comfort, in these times, which try men's souls, we know that there are vast multitudes whose daily human march is a requiem and that the sounds which go out to the very ends of the earth are the cries of sorrow and suffering.

We earnestly beseech Thee that our capacities of understanding and sympathy may be enlarged and expanded as we look about upon confused and baffled humanity with all its tragedy and agony.

Inspire us to be more eager to share our blessings with the needy and to impart unto them that abundant measure of heroic and triumphant faith which will support and sustain them in their trials and tribulations.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL HIGHWAY INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Works Subcommittee on Special Highway Investigations have permission to sit today and the rest of the week during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful indeed to the Members for the tribute they paid to me on yesterday, my 75th anniversary. I want to say that although I am chronologically 75 I am still young. I feel that I may have an old head but I have a young heart.

Somebody said that one is as young as his faith, as old as his doubts, as young

as his self-confidence, as old as his fears, as young as his hopes, as old as his despair.

Well, I have faith in the future, I have confidence in myself, I have hopes for the fulfillment of many aspirations, I have no doubt, I have no fears, I have no despair. I am still young.

Furthermore I wish to make an announcement. I wish to advise the House that the Committee on the Judiciary will initiate hearings tomorrow, May 8, on all legislative proposals before it relating to civil rights.

These hearings will be continued on the following dates: May 9, 15, 16, 23, 24, 28, and 29.

I make this announcement in order that any Member who may wish to testify or who may have a witness who wishes to testify should notify the Committee on the Judiciary as soon as possible in order that the proper schedule may be completed for the convenience of all concerned.

PER JACOBSSON WAS A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.